

BL
2720
R13

THE RADICAL

Published Monthly.

CONTENTS.

1. Woman and Science. A Chapter on the Enfranchisement and Education of Woman. I. *J. Stahl Patterson* 169
2. Conquest 185
3. Ethics of Sentiment and of Science. *O. B. Frothingham* 186
4. The Scarlet Oak in Winter 201
5. The Suez Canal. *J. Vila Blake* 202
6. "Lost Sinners." *C. K. Whipple* 226
7. To G. L. S. *D. A. W.* 230
8. Personality of God. *Charles Henry* 230
9. Notes 235

Messianic Notions outgrown. Mr. Frothingham's Lecture. Proteus. Liberal Orthodoxy. "Modern Skepticism." "The Independent" on What constitutes a Christian. The Radical Club. Cornell University. Mr. Beecher on A. D. Mayo's "Atheistical Educational Conscience." A Fashionable Entertainment. Ripley's Letters from Rome. Charles Turner on the Bible and Criticism. Notes from the People.
10. Reviews and Notices 251

BOSTON:

OFFICE OF PUBLICATION 25 BROMFIELD ST.

1870.

[Price, \$4.00 a Year. Single Numbers, 35 Cents.]

THE RADICAL, VOLUME VII.

CONTENTS OF JAN. NO.

The Confession. *D. A. Wasson.*
 Law of Habit. *John Weiss.*
 A Portrait of R. W. Emerson, by David Scott. *Ednah D. Cheney.*
 From Goethe's "Four Seasons." *T. D.*
 The Book of Daniel. *F. E. Abbot.*
 Liberal Religion in Europe. *Samuel Long-fellow.*
 The Family at Entenbruch. From the German of Gustav Pfarrius. *C. C. Shackford.*
 Patience. *A. E.*
 Notes.
 Reviews and Notices.

CONTENTS OF FEB. NO.

Christianity and its Definitions. *W. J. Potter.*
 My Star. *Edwin Morion.*
 Gates Ajar. *Fred May Holland.*
 A Sermon of Death. *Everett Finley.*
 Christianity and Free Religion. *C. K. Whipple.*
 Rich in the Lord. Addressed to Theodore Parker. *Frances Power Cobbe.*
 The Family at Entenbruch. From the German of Gustav Pfarrius. *C. C. Shackford.*
 By the Graves. *A. W. Bellaw.*
 Notes.
 Reviews and Notices.

Terms, \$4.00 a Year in advance. Single Copies mailed to any address for 35 cts.

Horticultural Hall Sunday Lectures. SECOND SERIES.

FEBRUARY 27.—F. E. ABBOT. "Jesus and Socrates in the History of Religion."
 MARCH 6.—JOHN S. DWIGHT. "Music."
 MARCH 13.—W. J. POTTER. "The Buckle and Carlyle Theories of History, as applied to Religious Development."
 MARCH 20.—EDNAH D. CHENEY. "The Function of Art in Life."
 MARCH 27.—D. A. WASSON. "Providence and Progress."
 APRIL 3.—W. H. CHANNING. "The Church of Universal Unity."
 APRIL 10.—WENDELL PHILLIPS.

Single Tickets, 50 cts. Six Single Tickets, \$2.00. For Sale by Fields, Osgood & Co. and Nichols & Noyes.

James Tolman, MERCHANT TAILOR,

111 Washington Street, Boston.

A Large and Well Selected Stock of

FOREIGN & AMERICAN GOODS

ALWAYS ON HAND,

Which will be made up in the best manner,

AT REASONABLE PRICES.

I.

lter.

hip-

dore

Ger-

ford.

es.

ry of

s of

."

& Co.

I.

Mr.

Up-

me

ev

rd.

S.

of

of

o.

THE RADICAL.

MARCH, 1870.

WOMAN AND SCIENCE.

A CHAPTER ON THE ENFRANCHISEMENT AND EDUCATION OF WOMAN.

I.

WE must accept the physiological method of studying man. The entire animate world is bound together by laws which relate to the whole, and we cannot understand one part without the study of other parts. We cannot understand woman without an extensive acquaintance with the animate forms below her. We cannot understand her relations to man without knowing what the constitutional differences are between her and man; and these constitutional differences we cannot understand without some knowledge of the method in which they have been brought about; and we cannot understand how they have been brought about without knowing something of the causes to which we may refer similar differences in the lower forms of organic existence.

Reference is here had, not to strictly sexual differences, but to such as are "secondary sexual." The plain feathers of the

female bird and the bright plumage of the male of the same species are not directly sexual; but the one always belongs to the female and the other to the male. The same is true in regard to certain characteristics, moral and physical, amongst mankind.

ANATOMICAL DIFFERENCES.

In the civilized races man is physically larger than woman; the osseous and muscular systems are more distinctly pronounced, and the shoulders are broader. Even the blood of the sexes is different, usually containing less fat and being heavier in man (Draper). In woman the form is more rounded, the tissues more delicate, and the pelvic region comparatively larger.

But in regard to the question of social and political rights, it is the nervous system, the brain especially, that we have to take into consideration. Man's brain is larger than woman's. It weighs on an average from four to eight ounces more; and this difference is already perceptible in early infancy.*

There is still another difference in favor of man. The brain is operative only in proportion to the supply of healthy blood. Man's larger chest affords to his larger brain the conditions of greater power than is afforded to woman's smaller brain, by the smaller capacity of her respiratory and circulating systems. This supposes that the blood is equally rich in the elements which go to supply cerebral waste; but possibly man has the advantage here in his active, out-door habits.

But may there not be compensation to the woman for the smaller size of her brain and the less supply of blood to the

* Tiedmann quoted by Morton. Dr. Boyd weighed the brains of two thousand and eighty-six males and one thousand and sixty-one females, of all ages; the adult male brains varied from one thousand three hundred and sixty-six to one thousand two hundred and eighty-five grammes, the female from one thousand two hundred and thirty-eight to one thousand one hundred and twenty-seven grammes. "So that the highest cerebral weight of the female is much less than the lowest male" (Vogt). In Wagner's table of nine hundred and sixty-four brains, arranged according to weight, the heaviest first, the diseased are mixed indiscriminately with the healthy; but even here the fact of the greater weight of man's brain is obvious, there being ninety-two in the first hundred, and only twenty-four in the last.

same? Her brain is larger in proportion to her body than is man's brain in proportion to his body (Reid). The hemispheres in woman's brain are greater in proportion to the other parts of the brain than in the case of man (Wagner). The surface of the brain formed by the convolutions is relatively greater in woman than in man: that is, in two brains of equal weight, the chances are that the greater superficies of the grey substance would belong to the female brain. If the grey substance be the seat of mental activity, as is altogether probable, and if woman's brain have thus the advantage of superficies in proportion to weight, this would be a decided compensation to her for the smaller volume of her brain. This fact is given on the authority of the younger Wagner of Göttingen, who compared eleven brains, eight of men and three of women, a number which is quite too limited, while the difficulty of such measurement is quite too great, to establish the general fact with sufficient exactness for scientific purposes. Carl Vogt of Geneva, who refers to Wagner's measurements, and who is by no means prejudiced in favor of woman, says, nevertheless, that there is probably a compensation to her for less volume of brain, in its greater relative superficies.

The compensation alleged to obtain in greater delicacy and fineness of texture is quite without satisfactory proof. The other textures of her system may indeed be finer, but they are also less compact, and the same may be true of the nerve cells of the brain. If it be true, as Dr. Maudsley* observes, that the growing use of the brain tends to concentrate a greater amount of activity in the same compass, it would follow that whichever sex may experience the greater sum of incentives to mental activity, the same would be endowed with greater richness of the cerebral cells; and since man's life is less circumscribed than woman's, its activities having more diversity and wider scope, the probabilities concerning superiority of texture would be on the side of man. But nothing of this kind can be positively affirmed. And how far the conditions of compensation above referred to may go to make up to woman for the less vol-

* *Physiology and Pathology of the Mind*, p. 60. Am. Ed.

ume of her brain, and its smaller supply of blood, it is equally impossible to say.

Volume and blood-supply are by no means the only points of comparison: equally important is that of conformation.

CONFORMATION OF BRAIN.

In cerebral structure monkeys and men are comparable; and there is a graduated scale beginning with the lowest monkey, passing through the anthropoid apes, and the lower races of men, till it finds its highest reach in the superior races of mankind. The comparison between the average male and female brain in our own race would be facilitated by ascertaining which of the two approaches most in its conformation to the cerebral type of the simia, or of the lower human races. The facts, so far as at present known, seem to indicate that woman's brain makes a nearer approach than man's to the inferior types. If this be so, it would suggest that, in the course of development, the female brain stops at a point beyond which the male brain passes.

Another method of comparing the male and female brains would be to ascertain which approaches in its conformation nearer to the infantile type of brain of the same race. There is a change of conformation constantly going on from infancy to maturity, and this change we must regard as a progressive one in the higher races of mankind. The matured man is a far higher being than he was when an infant, or child; that is, his powers and capabilities are far more diversified and complex. Anatomical researches go to show that, in this respect, the brain of woman approaches more nearly the infantile type than does the brain of man. If this be so, it would indicate that the female stops at a point beyond which the male brain proceeds with some further development.

The *sella turcica*, or "Turkish saddle," is a depression lying near the middle of the base of the cranium, and the angle of this depression is always more obtuse in the infantile than in the adult head; it is also more obtuse in woman's than in man's cranium. Tried by this angle, the order as to relative superiority

is, "man, woman, child, animal" (Welcker, quoted by Vogt). Having presented his facts, Vogt observes: "We may, therefore, say that the type of the female skull approaches, in many respects, that of the infant, and in a still greater degree that of the lower races." This opinion appears to be shared by Pruner Bey, Huschke, and Welcker, all of whom, as scientific men, have devoted especial attention to this subject.

Rudolph Wagner, recognizing the parallel scale of development afforded by the succession of forms assumed by the human foetus, and that presented by the races of apes and men, gives the first place to the brain of man, and the second to that of woman.* He further says, that in woman's brain, the development of the convolutions of the frontal lobe approaches more the simplicity of the foetal brain in its later stages, than does the development of the same convolutions in the brain of man.†

There can hardly be much doubt as to that part of the brain in which superiority lies. Gratiolet, who appears to believe that the brain acts as a unit, and that the faculties are not local, has shown, we think quite conclusively, that the meed of superiority must be awarded to the frontal lobe. It is the relative development of this part of the brain that determines the scale of intelligence amongst the primates as well as amongst men. In monkeys, the posterior lobes are developed earlier in foetal life than the frontal lobes; and the same is true of the corresponding vertebræ.‡ The development of the foetal brain of man follows the same law, while it is probable that the frontal vertebræ, relatively small at birth, may continue to expand till old age.§ In comparing the profiles of the adult and foetal brain, the difference is most striking in the greater relative deficiency in the latter of the upper frontal region; consequently, in after growth, it is the frontal brain that makes the greatest progress; in other words, it is the last maturing.||

* Wagner: *Vorstudien zu einer wissenschaftlichen Morphologie und Physiologie des menschlichen Gehirns als Seelenorgan*. Zweite Abhandlung, 29.

† Ibid. Erste Abhandlung, 89.

‡ Gratiolet: *Memoire sur les Plis Cerebraux de l'Homme et des Primates*, 39.

§ Ibid, 40.

|| Ibid, 40, 41.

Not only is the frontal lobe the most important part of the brain in a comparison of this kind, but the supreme importance attaches to the middle and uppermost stories of this lobe. It is here that probably the most complex thought, and the emotions dependent thereon, have the seat of their activity; and greater relative development of this part of the brain is an index to relative perfection, and a sign of superiority.*

Now if, as Wagner affirms, this part of the brain of woman is more like the foetal brain than the same part in the brain of man, then must we assign superiority to the latter.†

Let it be distinctly noted here, however, that what is true in an average sense is not always true in particular instances. Wagner observes that there are some women's brains with the complexity which usually pertains to men; and some men's brains with the defect in complexity which usually pertains to women.‡

The foregoing would appear to be tolerably conclusive with regard to the structure or conformation of the brain. This is a thing so tangible and definite, that comparison is not difficult; and I am not aware that there is any serious difference of opinion among scientific men with regard to the points of difference herein indicated. But there is still another method of comparison, which may be confirmatory or otherwise, of the cerebral differences. Possibly, structure may be compensated by something which science has not yet seized upon; and in consequence of such compensation, should it exist, the differences indicated by the anatomy of the brain might not appear in the character.

Character we take to be the expression in actual life of faculties which are conditioned by the corporeal organs, of which the brain is chief. Character is by no means so tangible and definite as structure, and our estimate of the same is far more likely to

* Gratiolet: *Memoire sur les Plis Cerebraux de l'Homme et des Primates*, 88.

† Rosseau says in "Emile," that they are doubtless wrong who regard woman as an imperfect man; yet he adds that "*l'analogie exterieure*" is on their side. Comte speaks of woman being a "perpetual infant," and fit only for domestic labors. We do not endorse such logical absolutism.

‡ *Vorstudien, Erste Abhandlung*, 90.

be vitiated by prejudice ; still it may be well in this connection to attempt an estimate of some of the relative psychical powers of men and women as they appear in actual life.*

EMOTIONAL SUPERIORITY OF WOMAN.

Woman is more predominantly emotional than man. She is more devoted to the objects of her love, and gives herself up more fully to the same. It may be true that woman's affectional nature is, in some respects at least, more diversified and complex than man's, that she has kinds of emotion which man has not, and that she is in this respect a more complicated creature than he.

A further evidence of the controlling influence of the affectional in woman is the fact, that, when the occasion calls it forth, she evinces more hate than man. If hate be one pole of the passionnal magnet, of which love is the other, we should expect this. It has been stated, that, in the torture of captives at the stake by the North American Indians, their women were worse than the men in giving themselves up to the frenzy of cruelty. It is known that during our late civil war the women of the South were the most spiteful of rebels. They have been all along the most contemptuous rejectors of reconstruction, and have to the last scorned the idea of Yankees settling amongst them.

Man has more executive force and more steadiness of purpose than has woman. If his emotional nature be less controlling than hers, we should expect him to have more persistence in executive energy. The emotions being greatly influenced by bodily conditions and by external excitants, a nature in which they are predominantly large would be likely to be turned aside

* This essay having been written in January, 1869, it could not profit by Mill's "Subjection of Women," or Lecky's chapter on Woman in his "History of European Morals," nor Dr. Laycock's chapter on Manhood and Womanhood in his work on "Mind and Brain." All of them treat of the relative powers of men and women, agreeing in most, though not in all particulars, with the views herein presented. I am satisfied to make no alterations in the text.

Not only is the frontal lobe the most important part of the brain in a comparison of this kind, but the supreme importance attaches to the middle and uppermost stories of this lobe. It is here that probably the most complex thought, and the emotions dependent thereon, have the seat of their activity; and greater relative development of this part of the brain is an index to relative perfection, and a sign of superiority.*

Now if, as Wagner affirms, this part of the brain of woman is more like the foetal brain than the same part in the brain of man, then must we assign superiority to the latter.†

Let it be distinctly noted here, however, that what is true in an average sense is not always true in particular instances. Wagner observes that there are some women's brains with the complexity which usually pertains to men; and some men's brains with the defect in complexity which usually pertains to women.‡

The foregoing would appear to be tolerably conclusive with regard to the structure or conformation of the brain. This is a thing so tangible and definite, that comparison is not difficult; and I am not aware that there is any serious difference of opinion among scientific men with regard to the points of difference herein indicated. But there is still another method of comparison, which may be confirmatory or otherwise, of the cerebral differences. Possibly, structure may be compensated by something which science has not yet seized upon; and in consequence of such compensation, should it exist, the differences indicated by the anatomy of the brain might not appear in the character.

Character we take to be the expression in actual life of faculties which are conditioned by the corporeal organs, of which the brain is chief. Character is by no means so tangible and definite as structure, and our estimate of the same is far more likely to

* Gratiolet: *Memoire sur les Plis Cerebraux de l'Homme et des Primates*, 88.

† Rosseau says in "Emile," that they are doubtless wrong who regard woman as an imperfect man; yet he adds that "*l'analogie exterieure*" is on their side. Comte speaks of woman being a "perpetual infant," and fit only for domestic labors. We do not endorse such logical absolutism.

‡ *Vorstudien, Erste Abhandlung*, 90.

be vitiated by prejudice ; still it may be well in this connection to attempt an estimate of some of the relative psychical powers of men and women as they appear in actual life.*

EMOTIONAL SUPERIORITY OF WOMAN.

Woman is more predominantly emotional than man. She is more devoted to the objects of her love, and gives herself up more fully to the same. It may be true that woman's affectional nature is, in some respects at least, more diversified and complex than man's, that she has kinds of emotion which man has not, and that she is in this respect a more complicated creature than he.

A further evidence of the controlling influence of the affectional in woman is the fact, that, when the occasion calls it forth, she evinces more hate than man. If hate be one pole of the passionnal magnet, of which love is the other, we should expect this. It has been stated, that, in the torture of captives at the stake by the North American Indians, their women were worse than the men in giving themselves up to the frenzy of cruelty. It is known that during our late civil war the women of the South were the most spiteful of rebels. They have been all along the most contemptuous rejectors of reconstruction, and have to the last scorned the idea of Yankees settling amongst them.

Man has more executive force and more steadiness of purpose than has woman. If his emotional nature be less controlling than hers, we should expect him to have more persistence in executive energy. The emotions being greatly influenced by bodily conditions and by external excitants, a nature in which they are predominantly large would be likely to be turned aside

* This essay having been written in January, 1869, it could not profit by Mill's "Subjection of Women," or Lecky's chapter on Woman in his "History of European Morals," nor Dr. Laycock's chapter on Manhood and Womanhood in his work on "Mind and Brain." All of them treat of the relative powers of men and women, agreeing in most, though not in all particulars, with the views herein presented. I am satisfied to make no alterations in the text.

by new impulses from a purpose which had been formed under the sway of a former emotion. Infants are more predominantly emotional than grown people, and less steady of purpose; uncultivated people are more predominantly emotional than civilized people, and they are infantile in their want of ability to carry out a design which requires considerable time, resistance to temptation, and the successful removal of obstacles, for its accomplishment. This infirmity of purpose is the inevitable accompaniment of a predominantly emotional nature; it is what the average woman loses in the greater fullness and diversity of her affectional endowments. The woman who retains sufficient control of herself to maintain conscious and consistent government in her family cannot be regarded as the type of her sex. The mother is usually a child amongst her children, moved to and fro by the diversified and contradictory appeals to her emotional sensibilities. Jean Paul Richter has aptly observed that a generaless would not give to her marching army the brief, effective, military word "halt," and let that do; but, instead, would say, "All you people, as soon as I am done speaking, I command you to stand still in your places,—halt, I tell you!" So fully are most women given over to this executive infirmity, that they have no adequate conception of the conditions of successful execution, and it cannot be imparted to them. Their general failure to maintain the orderly management of children is not due to the drudgery and distractions of domestic life, nor to the want of co-operation on the part of fathers, so much as to the want of a proper understanding of the legitimate conditions of successful home government. The defect is mainly an intellectual one, in consequence of which little attempt is made to impose that restraint upon the capriciousness of temper which executive success requires.

It is difficult to treat this subject without misunderstanding. All mothers are not as here represented: there are note-worthy exceptions, just as there are women with the the masculine size, complexity, and conformation of brain; and there are some men as infirm of purpose as it is womanish to be, just as there are some men who have the female type of brain.

This superiority in the masculine will is due, no doubt, in a

great measure to the more controlling influence of intellect in man. We speak of the entire intellect as a unit. We are aware of those analyses of the entire intellect whereby one portion thereof is assumed to be masculine and another portion feminine, and the whole nicely balanced as equal in man and woman. We shall spend no time with criticism on these nice distinctions, and far more fanciful than real, nor shall we attempt any such doubtful analysis. Our appeal shall be made to the facts direct.

INTELLECTUAL SUPERIORITY OF MAN.

Of all the truths in science which have been discovered during the last three hundred years, of all the discoveries in the arts which have been made during the same time, of all those truths and arts which are now lifting mankind into the realm of a higher civilization than they have ever before known,—of all these, what proportion is due to the intellect of woman? If woman possesses that instinctive subtilty of logic, that lightning rapidity of unconscious deduction, which is claimed for her, what has she been doing all these needy ages of the world, that history has set nothing down to her credit in the discovery of revolutionary arts and truths? A few women have evinced a creditable mastery of masculine thought, as Miss Martineau, Mrs. Somerville, and some others; but woman is not an original discoverer. Why? It does not explain it to say that she might not have had opportunity as a student. Some of our very greatest thinkers and discoverers have been unambitious, modest, retiring men, and very many of them had to battle with the disadvantages of poverty and obscurity. How much greater the advantages of individual women, born in the midst of wealth and opportunity, than of some of those boys! Then why have they not distinguished themselves as thinkers and discoverers? The answer is simple and obvious. The mental forces of woman do not impel her in this direction. Unless prevented by outward conditions, every individual mind acts in the direction of its strongest faculties. Such direction is due to the composition of forces, as in mechanics: it is an example of resultant motion. Woman takes the affectional sphere of activity; man, the sphere

of thought and execution ; and, whatever exceptions might be named, this general truth would remain unaffected.

In order that an idea may possess the mind of woman, it must be associated with a feeling ; on the other hand, a naked thought, by its own inherent energy, may seize upon the mind of a man and dominate it almost to madness till he has wrought it out a glorious truth. Newton succeeded by constant thinking. Women of intellect take to the *belles lettres*, rather than to science ; and the most of reading women delight their emotional nature with sensational novels.

An additional point of comparison, and a very important one, has reference to logical method,—to the course which the mind pursues in reaching its conclusions. There are two methods distinctly drawn and very diverse. According to one, the mind desires a certain logical result ; and it never fails to end in that result by the course of reasoning adopted. The logical powers are unconsciously subordinated by the feelings. Theological reasoning generally, Mrs. Farnham's "Woman and her Era," and Mrs. Willard's "Sexology," afford striking examples of this method. It would be amusing to illustrate by detail ; but we propose to do nothing of the kind here. A great deal of that instinctive and subtle deduction by which conclusions are mysteriously and suddenly reached, and in which pre-eminence is claimed for woman, is very often nothing else than desire skipping entire segments of the logical chain, in consequence of which there is no assurance of correctness in the results obtained.

Allied to this is what Mr. G. H. Lewes, the historian of philosophy, characterizes as the "bell-wether" method of forming opinions. It is a sort of sympathetic or contagious impulse, by virtue of which the unthinking masses catch their opinions from dogmatic leaders. It is the contagion of mere feeling dominating the intellect. Whether it be casting odium on a truth, or traducing a thinker, no matter ; the charge of moral delinquency is easily established, if the leaders of public opinion only desire it, and put in train the well-known methods of securing conviction. And after the wrong thus done has become apparent to minds logically just, and reparation has been made by the think-

ing few, the old impression is still fixed upon the mass of minds as a corroding poison, and it can only be removed through the intervention of changed feelings for the object of odium, brought about by other than logical means, or through the same "bell-wether" method by which the impression was originally fixed. Neither sex is exempt from this weakness; it prevails, alas, too generally: but the exceptions will usually be found amongst men. Woman is as ready as man to believe evil of woman;* and for one that has absolutely fallen, she has no charity, though the only difference between the two may be that temptation has come to the one with an accumulation of seductive power with which it never assailed the other. "It is a fact beyond cavil that it is the sentence of their own sex against them that degrades women; they voluntarily interpret and apply the laws that men have laid down for their behavior with a remorseless rigor reprobated even by the lawgivers themselves." †

We can rarely remove a prejudice by appealing to reason: far more readily can it be done by operating upon the affections without the remotest regard to the severities of logic; and this we believe to be more generally true of women than of men. Under liberalizing tendencies woman is the last to cling to the absurdities of dogma and superstition. She only yields to the changes of a progressive civilization when they have become inevitable. It is conceded on all hands that woman is herself the worst enemy to the extension of her educational and political privileges.

The other logical method above referred to is that which subordinates the feelings to the intellect. The one great effort of such a mind is to divest itself of all prejudice, of all desire that may operate in the secret chambers of the mind to derange the logical processes and vitiate the results to be obtained. The

* A well-known magazine article, published since the above was written, betrays the complicity of genius with the itch of gossip, under the pretext of justice and morality, — a pretext which any gossip might allege, — to disregard the sanctities of the grave, and, in casting ignominy upon the dead, to blast the peace of the living. Little would be thought of the manliness of a man who should give himself to such a work.

† Westminster Review, April, 1868; p. 221.

mind having adopted this method, pursues its inductive and deductive processes with a supreme desire for the truth, whether that truth be agreeable or disagreeable. This quality of mind, furthermore, is not simply an intellectual virtue; it is a moral one as well. We may look with confidence to such a mind for the supreme desire of justice, not only to truth for its own sake, but of justice to individuals for truth's sake. Blind, contagious intellectual impulse finds no lodgment in such a mind.

If an acute observer and original thinker brings to light a pregnant truth which is incompatible with the prevalent modes of thought, and dangerous to existing interests, as that of the antiquity of man, by Boucher de Perthes, who are the helpers — and they often tardy — that come to the rescue with efficient aid amidst the storm of persecution that usually rises? The men of brains, minds thoroughly imbued with the scientific method, and they only. Precious are the resources of intellectual justice: it is moral as well as intellectual, — the highest virtue known! Mr. Lecky, in his excellent "History of Rationalism in Europe" (Vol. II. 93), affirms that this mental aptitude, in consequence of which we love for its own sake whatever may be evolved by the purest logical processes as truth, whether it be at accord or discord with our prepossessions, is the highest virtue of civilization, a virtue which is yet known only to the few, and scarcely at all to woman.

In the scale of mental endowments we assign, with Comte, Buckle, Mill, Draper, and even Spencer and Lecky, the leading place to the intellect. It is this that contributes most to the improvement of the conditions of life, extending the sphere of human powers, and multiplying the possibilities and resources of human happiness. The intellect is almost a creator. If it has not made new senses for man, it has made a part of those he already possesses, far more exquisite and powerful than they could otherwise have been. By its aid the modern eye looks deep into the universe, and extorts the secrets of planets and stars. It unseals, too, the little worlds of existence, and we learn thereby the structure of tissues, and the form and habits of creatures hitherto completely hid away in the recesses of the invisible. The intellect has given new power to speech, and a force

to utterance, whereby a concert of innumerable tongues are answering to each other across sea and land. It is the intellect that has added to the strength and skill of the human hand, in consequence of which one may now do the work of many in times past, and with a precision and skill hitherto unknown. It is intellect that has seized upon the forces of nature and set them to work for man's own good. The superior energies of modern civilization are due solely to the intellect as the leading faculty of the mind.

In whatever concerns the rendering of aid to man in any of the various conditions of life, it is the intellect alone that can give it point and efficacy. Does the hand of power lay heavy upon the people? There is no hope but in the general increase of intelligence. Alms-giving may prove a curse; the remedy is to be found in the exercise of judgment. The insane were once treated with pitiless cruelty: science has forever cast out the devils, and commanded us to administer to those unfortunate human beings with sympathy and kindness. Charity to our fellows,—the disposition to accord to every human being the just sovereignty over himself,—liberalism and humanity can only be advanced by the culture of intelligence. Striking down the red hand of persecution has been the work of the intellect; and it is mainly through a just discernment of the relations of things, and the intellectual control of social conditions, that there can be progress in morals. The intellect regally assumes its right to supremacy whether we will or no.

Just as the intellectual region of the brain is the last maturing in the individual, so are the intellectual activities of society the latest in developing; and, as the former carries the individual to his highest reach of dignity and power, so does the latter lift society into its highest possible forms. It is intellect in the individual, and intellect in the aggregate man, that primarily tells most for human weal.

We believe that the facts of history and of actual life only go to confirm the inferences of anatomy.* And if woman evinces

* If it were our purpose to press all the considerations which go to establish the correspondence of character and brain in woman, we might urge, among others, the telling fact of her more infantile fondness for personal ornamentation, a taste which civilized men have somewhat outgrown.

less of this leading faculty of the mind, if she is less deeply baptized into the genuine spirit of successful research and triumphant execution, there is a sufficient reason for it, a reason for which she is by no means responsible. Whatever the fact may be, we may be sure that it is not arbitrary. Whatever the differences between men and women, we may confidently refer them to the operation of natural law; but of this, in its special relations to our subject, more hereafter. In regard to the fact of differences, a few considerations may here be added.

PHYSIOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS.

Woman matures earlier than man, and possibly the process of intellectual development ceases with her at a point beyond which it carries him. Man, male and female, is longer maturing than any known creature of equal size; and it may be legitimately inferred that this greater length of time is made necessary by the greater complexity of endowment to which he attains; and since the human male is longer reaching the maturity of all his powers than the female, there is ground to infer that he reaches a point of organic complexity in some part of his being to which she does not attain. There is one respect, however, in which, as Mrs. Farnham maintains, woman's organization is more complex than man's,—the reproductive system and the emotional nature dependent thereon. Granted. If man does not develop as great complexity here as woman, we are led to suspect that he is meantime developing at least a compensating measure of complexity in some other part of the organic system, and in some other branch of the mental constitution. This would be fairly inferable if man is held to possess an equal amount of constitutional activity with woman, and ceased the process of growth and evolution at the same age. But while man's physiological activities appear to be about equal with woman's up to the age of puberty, they now greatly transcend hers. The continued growth of the chest and the expansion of his lungs enable him to oxygenate a much larger quantity of blood than is oxygenated in the case of women. At the age of puberty "respiration becomes twice as energetic in

the man, although it remains the same as before in the woman." * There is evidently a compensation to woman during this period of her life by the activity of a function of her system which man has not ; for after this function ceases her respiratory activity increases, though it never becomes equal to that of man. This affords some measure of the relative aggregate of activity in the male and female systems. And as man's brain is larger, and the arteries and veins passing to and from it more capacious, and the blood richer in the red globules which nourish (Hunter), we have reason to suspect that there are activities going on in the brain of man to an extent which does not obtain in the experience of woman. And as he continues to develop for two or three years longer than she, the ground for this inference is made still stronger.

It is a law, well known to physiologists, that active development in one direction is apt to be at the expense of development in some other direction. If the measure of the vital forces to be expended in development be supposed to be uniform, then if any faculty or part absorbs an unusually large quantity of such forces, the excess of expenditure thus made must leave a deficiency in the nourishing forces of other parts or faculties. If the latter do not suffer, in consequence, some degree of deprivation, the supply must be increased. If woman develop a complexity in the reproductive system, and the emotional nature allied with it, which man does not, then must she fall behind him in some other department of active development, or else her supply of the physiological forces must be greater than his. But, as we have just seen, they are less ; and just when she abates activity in her individual career of organic evolution, man is expanding more rapidly than ever.

It is in this connection that the fact already referred to becomes very significant,—the fact that the female brain-type bears a greater similitude to the infantile brain-type than does that of man. This suggests that the surplus of energy which man develops at puberty goes, in part at least, to

* Quatrefages : *Metamorphoses of Man and the Lower Animals*. London Ed., 43, 44.

push the development of his brain somewhat beyond that of woman.*

To this we must add the probable fact maintained by Huschke, Welcker, and Vogt, that there is a greater difference between the male and female brain among civilized peoples than between the male and female brain among uncultivated peoples.† If this be true, as a general fact, we may affirm that this increasing difference between the brains of men and women, as civilization advances, must be due to the form which civilization has heretofore assumed. If the falling behind of woman in the career of development be an evil, there is great need that we search out the causes, and apply the remedy; and herein may lie one of the best of reasons for the enlargement of woman's educational opportunities.

In treating of this subject I have used terms of comparison because they were necessary to express the ideas I wished to convey. I have allowed no considerations of gallantry to prevent me from being faithful to what I regard as a plain and truthful statement of the case. I am well aware that the comparison is liable to be construed as invidious. If Humboldt and others could object to the terms "superior" and "inferior," as applied to the races of men, still more might objection be made to their application in speaking of the sexes. Yet I must think that there is no just ground for offense. If it were positively known that these cerebral distinctions of sex are fixed and unchangeable by a divine decree, and that corresponding distinctions in character are equally fixed, then indeed would it be humiliating to be regarded as the inferior, and hardly any motive would justify us in the statement of facts upon which such application of the term might rest. In that event, we might, perhaps, just as well pooh aside woman's claim for better educational conditions by an appeal to the vanity of sex with

* In connection with the series of cerebral facts given early in this essay, and in connection with the physiological considerations here stated, it is somewhat interesting to note the fact given by Darwin, that, in the lower animals, new characters are most apt to spring up in the male sex. *Domestication*, Vol. II., 106, 107.

† Carl Vogt: *Lectures on Man*. London Ed., 81, 82.

small talk and flattery. But if these cerebral distinctions of sex, and diverging qualities of character, have been brought about, even in part, by the different conditions to which the sexes have been subjected in times past, and if by changing the conditions a change can be effected in these cerebral and mental distinctions, then is there no just ground for offense. Again, if this view be correct, if conditions mold character and that upon which character depends,—the nervous system,—then would the fact of such inferiority, as herein indicated, give to woman a logical vantage-ground, which she might use with effect in agitating for enlarged opportunity. Hardly a stronger plea could be made in her appeal to man for justice. We believe that this cerebral and mental inferiority, in part, stands forth the incontestible proof of the inferiority of the educational conditions of woman in times past; and we believe, further, that the only remedy for any factitious inferiority that may exist is to be found in the widening of woman's sphere and the enlargement of her educational opportunities. But this is anticipating. When more of the data are before us, we may treat of this more fully.

J. STAHL PATTERSON.

CONQUEST.

I.

UNEQUAL ways
O'er earth prevailing:
Truth's gathering rays
The Old assailing.

II.

Grim masks of Fate,
The Real concealing,
Gone out of date
'Fore Truth's revealing.

THE ETHICS OF SENTIMENT AND OF SCIENCE.

JESUS referred continually to the Ten Commandments of the Hebrew law, — "Thou shalt not commit adultery," "Thou shalt not kill," "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not bear false witness," and so forth; laws made for a wild, tempestuous people in wild tempestuous times, but which, with here and there an exception, are kept without difficulty by the majority of those who live in civilized communities. Were these alone, in their literal form, in question, we might probably rank ourselves high in the kingdom of heaven. Nay, our society, in its more respectable grades, might be taken as representative of the kingdom. People of average morality do not murder, or rob, or commit perjury, or use profane language, or betray their neighbors. But Jesus does not prescribe these commandments in their literal form. He refines on them exceedingly, giving them deep interpretations, taking them from the region of action into the region of motive, construing them according to their inward intent, making them bear on thoughts and desires, and carrying obedience to them up into the highest departments of character. Thus, where the old law says, "Thou shalt not kill," he says, "Thou shalt not be angry;" where the old law says, "Thou shalt not perjure thyself," he says, "Thou shalt not bind thyself by an oath;" where the old law says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," he says, "Thou shalt not entertain wandering desires;" where the old law says, "Thou shalt not steal," he says, "Give to him that asketh of thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not away." The old law allowed retaliation; he commands non-resistance. The old law permits blood revenge; he enjoins passive acquiescence under injury and insult. The old law limits charity to kindred and neighbors; he bids his disciples love their enemies, bless those that curse them, do good to those that hate them, and pray for those that despite-

fully use and persecute them. In a word, Jesus virtually institutes a new moral code; and it is this new code that he has in mind when he declares that the man who hears his sayings and does not keep them is like a fool who builds his house on the sand. What sandy foundations, then, our modern houses are built on! How low a place in the kingdom the nineteenth-century men must hold! What a multitude of insignificant people there must be in it! Nay, how scanty a representation of civilized humanity is likely to be found there, occupying places even the humblest! Such a declaration brings our age to judgment, taking society at its best. For it is not too much to say that these commandments of Jesus, these precepts of love, pity, renunciation, deep and beautiful as they are, have scarcely a visible effect on our society, are scarcely apparent in the general conduct of life, personal, domestic, social, commercial, or political, are in truth hardly recognized as binding on the secular conscience of men. They are lauded and disregarded, eulogized and repudiated, in their plain and literal sense. Do we lend to every one who wishes to borrow? Not till we are well satisfied of the security. Do we give to every one that asks? Not unless we are sure of his merit, nor always then. If a hall thief steals our coat, we do our best to seize him before he gets our cloak also. If a pick-pocket takes our purse, we call the police. Should an officer accost us in the street, and bid us go on some public business for him, we should report him at headquarters, and have him discharged. We are occasionally insulted. Do we sit down satisfied that it is impossible for one man to insult another? We are now and then assailed. Whose cheek is apt to be smitten in consequence? We hear the Sermon on the Mount read, as we sit in our pews on Sunday, and are touched with a glow of enthusiasm. But if the words came home to the hearers laden with meaning, would they, remembering the maxims they acted on through the week, be able to sit quietly in their seats and listen? The very preachers of the new law do not recognize it as binding in the ordinary business of life. An eloquent minister of our neighborhood, whose faith in Jesus is of an evangelical stamp, who believes in the inspiration of the Scriptures, and holds his congregation to strict regard for the Christian code of

morals, pronounced a eulogy on the sword before a military association; he did it without an apology to his Master, and with a relish that showed how wide is the gulf between the ethics of the pulpit and the ethics of the platform. The civil war, on whose issue we congratulate ourselves, in which the vast majority of our people invested so much heart and soul, a war more than sanctioned, we think, by divine necessities and human ends, a war of civilization, — in some sense it was held a holy war, — was justified by no lessons of Matthew or Luke. The New Testament was closed and forgotten while it went on. If a preacher ventured to quote the Sermon on the Mount as prescribing the duty of the hour, he was charged with disloyalty. The voice of Jesus was unheard amid the clash of arms, though the arms were brandished in defense of the nation's life, and used in the cause of republican liberty.

Was that voice heard in the call of the Sanitary Commission? We bless the Sanitary Commission. We shall never forget the heroism of the women it employed, or the tenderness of the men. Its graciousness shed a perfume on all the fields of blood, that will linger in men's minds as long as the memory of the strife endures. But the Sanitary Commission was, in purpose and intent as well as in fact, one of the most powerful auxiliaries of the war spirit. Its ministry was not a ministry of peace; it bore no olive branch; it parted no combatants. Its business was to revive the courage and restore the vigor of the drooping soldier, to allay his discontent, alleviate his suffering, and hasten his return to the field. Its managers and agents were enthusiasts for the war, who wrought in the interests of patriotism, not in the interests of pacification.

Did our zeal for the Cretans grow out of our zeal for the precepts of Matthew? Was it quite consistent for disciples of the meek Nazarene to echo the Greek cry of war to the death, and call on churches to aid the subject islanders in their desperate attempt to throw off the dominion of the Turk? It may all be done in the spirit of enthusiasm for humanity as it is popularly interpreted: but does that spirit find countenance in the books that bid men love their enemies, and bless their persecutors? It is the inconsistency I remark on, not the conduct. The incon-

sistency declares that the generation tacitly disowns the peculiar morality of the Sermon on the Mount.

But may not this be a sign of our moral degeneracy? a sign that in time will pass away? May we not, while confessing this degeneracy with humbleness of heart, still hope and anticipate the time when we shall be faithful to the lofty morality of the first Gospels? Are we not approaching that time? Are not the signs of it visible already? Such may be the sanguine prediction of faith, but such is not the sober expectation of philosophy or observation. A sincere study of the tendency of thought in our generation will incline one to think that instead of approaching, however slowly and cautiously, the epoch when the law of love shall be accepted, and people shall live according to its decrees, we are gradually, but decidedly, *receding* from that time. The influence of the printed Sermon on the Mount would seem on the decline rather than on the increase. In the first two centuries of Christendom, the words of Jesus were all powerful in their effect on those who professed to receive them as authority. At their bidding human relations fell into original shapes. Communities silently organized themselves according to the new commandment. Lives were regulated by the poetic standard of charity. The heavenly kingdom on earth was attempted; there was no violence, no quarrel, no litigation, no fraud. Self-sacrifice was the rule; beneficence was the practice; kindness was the instituted order. Word for word, the lovely precepts of an ideal humanity were taken and acted on in a spirit so simple and childlike, that the pagan world wondered, exclaiming, "*How these Christians love one another!*" Later again, in what we call the middle ages,—the period that bridges over the gulf between the Old World and the New,—we find abundant instances of full and exact conformity with the new commandment enunciated by Jesus. St. Francis D'Assisi and his followers of the Franciscan Order, with others too numerous to mention, priests, monks, friars, sisters, nuns, men and women, who either privately, or in groups, carried out the theory of the primitive Gospels, illustrated to perfection the maxims we read in the evangelists. They owed no debt but the debt of love; they sold what they had and gave alms; they reduced existence to the

lowest terms of physical comfort ; they took from their back the garments they wore, and clothed the naked ; they submitted meekly to insult and violence ; they cut off their right hands, and plucked out their right eyes, and turned their right or left cheek to the smiter. They spent their years and their strength in toiling for the lowest, the most humiliated, the most abandoned of men ; they possessed nothing ; they were above governments, for Christ was their king ; they were not subject to law, for they knew no law but love. The further back we go, the more complete is the type of conformity to the standard set up by the heavenly Nazarene.

Again, the mode of life required by the new commandment is exhibited best by the members of that oldest church in Christendom which represents the social genius of the middle ages. The Church of Rome will show us many a sample of this kind of Christian here in New York. The priests and preachers of that church inculcate the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount, without reserve or qualification, as the only sure groundwork of Christian society. If this form of society were to be exemplified in the *future*, we might expect to find the believers in the future the workers for the future, the apostles of the future,—the so-called “Liberals” advocating it now. But they are not found doing so ; they are found, with one consent, departing from it. The Liberal Christians, as we name them, do indeed lay claim to the credit of holding up the Sermon on the Mount as their central rallying point, their manual of faith and practice, their book of creed and confession, their summary of divinity, their testament of discipleship ; but, as a class, the Liberal Christians are disciples of modern science and culture, reformers after the latest school of wisdom, professors of political and social economies, eminent as citizens, patriots, educators ; in short, distinguished more for many things than for allegiance to the ethics of the New Testament. Those they leave to the enthusiasts, as they call them, the doctrinaires, the Utopians. Unless the Catholic Church is to rule the future,—which may science, philosophy, common sense and humanity forbid !—it seems likely that they who try to live according to the literal

Ethics of Sentiment and Science. 191

code of the New Testament will rather diminish in number than multiply as the ages of civilization go on.

Nor can we rest content when so much as *this* has been said. We must go further, and declare our belief that a faithful and close observance of the precepts announced in the Sermon on the Mount would not ensure a condition of society which we modern people should care to describe as a *heavenly* kingdom? What would be the effect, for instance, of promiscuous alms-giving? Pauperism, of course, of a desperate character, and on a boundless scale, as it prevails in Catholic Europe. What would be the effect of the indiscriminate lending of money to borrowers? The demoralizing of the borrowers, the impoverishing of the lenders. What would be the effect of passive non-resistance to wrong? In most places, the triumph of the beast over the man. What would be the effect of surrendering rights at the summons of the insolent and overbearing? The rapid decline of self-respect, the cessation of moral struggle, the abandonment of the hope of social progress. It is unnecessary to detail possibilities. A saving instinct restrains mankind when they would yield to the fascinating visions of a sentimental philanthropy. And not a saving *instinct* merely, a saving *knowledge* comes to their rescue. Again and again has the experiment been tried of building up society on this angelic plan. At the very time that Jesus taught, the Essenes were trying it, hard by in the country neighboring to Jerusalem. So like were their doctrines to his, that it has been a favorite theory with some fine minds that Jesus was himself an Essene, or, at least, a sympathizer with that strange order of people. The theory is fanciful, but it has some countenance. In that popular community existence was punctually, and in every respect, regulated by the precepts we are considering. There every maxim written in Matthew and Luke was carried out in principle and practice. The Essenes were model Christians after this pattern of goodness. They were distinguished for their close affection for one another; they had all possessions in common; they were greatly "given to hospitality." In traveling, they carried no purse, but went from house to house among the brotherhood. They held the same views respecting marriage that were entertained by Jesus and his apostles; not absolutely

condemning it, but awarding more praise to celibacy. In fidelity to personal trusts they were eminent. Peacemakers they were, denouncing war, whether offensive or defensive. They abjured oaths in secular and civil intercourse, disapproving all exaggerations of speech. They were ascetics in food and drink, and all sensual pleasures. They abstained from public life, took no part in national affairs, and devoted themselves to the love of God, the love of goodness, and the love of man. There were no poor among them, and no rich; no great and no small; no privileged and no unprivileged. They were a sort of socialists. Nor were the Essenes a solitary body. Similar societies existed all over the East before them and contemporary with them. The Orientals had a passion for those brotherhoods of men and women, wherein property was discarded, secular authority disallowed, and the law of affection made supreme over all relations. And what became of these societies? It is difficult to obtain authentic information about them now, so completely have they disappeared. What was their contribution to the powers that push the world onward? Nothing. What condition of things did they produce among the populations in the midst of which they were established? A condition, we are bound to say, of want, inactivity, and decadence, that commonly went as far as misery. It may be a bold and an abrupt thing to say, but still sincerity requires that it should be said; the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount, in the places and times wherein they had been put in force,—in their own native land, for instance, among the people whose genius naturally fell in with them,—have not shown themselves possessed of redeeming or recuperating, inspiring or impelling power. Where they have been most faithfully tried they have most signally failed. The East sets no moral or social example for the West. They who in our time profess allegiance to that touchingly beautiful and ideal morality, who advocate its adoption, pray for its acceptance, hope for its spread and triumph, do nevertheless put on it all the while their own interpretations, interpretations in many instances so forced and fallacious, that the original sense is quite forgotten, and the original purpose is completely overruled. A new code disguises itself under the old formula; the voice is

Ethics of Sentiment and Science. 193

the voice of Jacob, but the hands are the hands of Esau. Commentators have a prodigious skill in verifying the adage that "Language is an instrument devised to conceal thoughts." The grand old Bible is wonderfully translated in their hands, so that the wayfaring man thinks himself a fool as he reads.

Do not understand me, in these remarks, as casting the smallest reflection on the great person who first proclaimed this new commandment of love and trust. His fame remains undimmed. For his fame is not compromised, as I conceive, by the misapprehension of his friends. A poet and a saint, living himself in heaven, and breathing heavenliness through his lips and his life, he described the principles that would constitute the heavenly state, never dreaming that unheavenly men would try to produce that state by copying rules they could not incarnate; little suspecting that his fine poetry would be suddenly translated into prose. My criticism touches not him nor his divine thought. It simply touches those who, far beneath him, presumed to think they could live on his thought before they were born into his spirit. Inspirers must not be treated as dictators, nor prophets as pedagogues.

These points, then, I am constrained to make. The Sermon on the Mount is not at present the recognized law of moral conduct in Protestant Christian communities. There is no probability that it ever will become so if the existing order of civilization continues to prevail. Even *were* there a probability of it, we should contemplate such a prospect with emotions not wholly of joy. It would not fulfill the dream that Jesus himself cherished. Profoundly sensible as I am of the shortcomings of modern society, deeply anxious as I am regarding its future, eager as I am in the desire that it should be raised to a higher level of principle and character, I cannot see the fearful depravity that so many see in the failure to practice among ourselves the doctrines of the earliest Christians. I do not look forward to the day when the ethics of the Sermon on the Mount shall prevail in our applied moralities; nor can I pray for the coming of such a kingdom as they have in times past inaugurated. If the statement sounds audacious, I have only to beg all who think it is to reflect seriously on the matter, to analyze their own con-

duct, to search their own hearts, to come to a sincere understanding with themselves, to adjust their thoughts to the world they live in, and then make reply as in presence of the holy truth. The secret I have uttered is an open one. It should be a secret no longer.

The truth is, that we live in a different age from that which Jesus beautified with his presence; and, living in a different age, we live on a different principle. Not with any less veneration of excellence; not with any less of aspiration; not with any abatement of moral vigor or moral hope; not with a diminished earnestness; not with a less persistent endeavor after perfection; not with a lowered standard or a blemished ideal, or a dimmed vision, or a deadened soul: but with another plan, another idea, another method. And on the clearness with which we perceive this, and the sincerity with which we confess it, and the resolution with which we hold by it, depends our success in making society approach more nearly its normal condition than it now does.

We modern men are called on to choose between the *ethics of sentiment* and the *ethics of science*. For here is the distinction between the morality of the New Testament and our own. *The ethics of sentiment*. I use the phrase with entire respect. Of all admirable things, nothing is more admirable in its place than sentiment, when it is elevating, noble, and pure, as the Sermon on the Mount pre-eminently is. Loftier aspiration, sweeter feeling, tenderer emotion, lovelier visions of the world as it might be, and would be if men and women were not men and women, — more enchanting dreams of the paradise of a new world were never suggested in language. It is the prophecy of a heart that never knew guile or suspicion; a heart that was heavenly in every emotion, that felt no break between desire and duty, and took up all mankind with it into the sky of its faith. But sentiment, even such delicious sentiment as this, will not answer as a working code for men. Ends and means are different things. Emotions are not ideas. Feelings are not principles. Visions are not laws. The Sermon on the Mount enriches the heart, glorifies the imagination, and inspires the soul; but it fails to instruct the conscience in its details of duty.

On how many practical and pressing problems it throws no beam of light? How few of our modern questions, raised by an age of enterprise, industry, commerce, does it meet! How little aid it furnishes towards equitable methods of dealing with any of the stern issues of the day; with the issue between labor and capital, work and wages, debtor and creditor, governors and governed, man and woman in their industrial and civil relations, superior and inferior races, the virtuous and the vicious, the orderly and the disorderly classes, the law-makers and the law-breakers! Over these high peaks of duty it soars as the dove floats over a village. And for this reason: sentimental morality assumes a human nature so far purified and developed into the angelic, that the most sublimated feelings can be called on and counted on, at any moment, to come down like spirits from the air, suddenly and by miracle, to restore the haggard earth. As if men only needed to wish that heaven should appear, in order to will that it might appear! It has but one word,—Love. "*Love God; love one another; love your neighbors; love your enemies; love all the children of the heavenly Father; love all the creatures of God.*" As if men *could* love at the word of command! As if love needed no guidance or instruction! As if love alone, unaided by wisdom, truth, and justice, would avail to deliver humanity! As if love itself were not so various in quality, so liable to be found mixed with dirt and dross, that only the finest sifting rendered it good for noble uses! As if love required no skill or tact or administrative ability, but had only to pour out its flood of affection, as water pours from a fountain! An atmosphere with nothing in it but oxygen! Why, the world would burn up in a day!

"*Every one according to his needs,*" is the motto of this delicious code. It asks not who you are, what you are, where you came from, what you have done, or can do, or mean to do, or have the heart to do: it asks only what you have suffered. Have you a pain, a want, a sorrow? "Come unto me and find rest. Here is food for you; here is sympathy and consolation; here is patience, pity, tenderness, compassion, forgiveness; here is balm for every hurt of body and soul." As if *need* and *meed* always corresponded! As if want and worth were synonymous

terms! As if all who asked had a right to receive! As if all suppliants required the same blessing! As if that same gift was tenderness and pity and graciousness! As if needs did not have to be classified according to causes, and character, and conditions, and circumstances, and dealt with accordingly! As if there were one panacea, even for moral and spiritual ills! As if the only people to be consulted in this great matter of kindness were those who *felt* the needs, while those who *supplied* the needs were simply to practice the graces of generosity, forgetfulness, denial of self, unsparing devotion to the work of philanthropy! On a theory like this, human society could not go forward. I do not forget that a few people, of exceptional character, *have* lived on this rule; but the fact that they were exceptional characters proved the rule to be impracticable. In the East it has been ineffectual. In the West it could not be so much as tried.

But stop, some will say: you are proceeding too fast. In criticising the Sermon on the Mount, you forget the impregnable portion of it, the very kernel of it, the Golden Rule, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you, do ye even so unto them." Is not that comprehensive enough? Is that other than entirely sound and sensible? Is that fantastical or romantic? The Orientals fabricated it, but what Westerner can find fault with its texture and form? And the whole of Jesus' ethics is there. Pardon me if I seem over-critical, even to the point of being captious; but even here I detect, and without difficulty, the same peculiarity I have been remarking on. The Golden Rule may *involve* a principle, but it does not *appeal* to a principle. It says, "do unto others as ye *would* that they should do unto you." The criterion, then, is a wish, a desire, a feeling; perhaps a transient mood, perhaps a whim. "*Whatsoever ye would.*" But we would, all of us, be pitied and petted and loaded with costly gifts, for which we have nothing to pay. If poor, we would have men feed us; if naked, we would have men clothe us; if idle, we would have men support us; if vicious, we would have men indulge us; if worthless and criminal, we would have men bear with us and pardon us. Must we then so deal with our fellows, bestowing a promiscuous pity, flinging about

Ethics of Sentiment and Science. 197

an indiscriminate bounty, deluging the worst of mankind with a gushing affection that gives them a sea to wallow in instead of a gutter? This is what would come of taking men as they are. We must maintain the paupers, release the prisoners, and allow the wicked to go unpunished and unredeemed. The Golden Rule would work nobly in the hands of noble people. But in the hands of ignoble people might it not work otherwise? Does it not suppose a healthy condition of desire? And is not a healthy condition of desire the very object a rule is intended to attain? Given well-wishing men, the Golden Rule tells us how they must live. But it has displayed no genius for managing ill-wishing men. It expresses a beautiful sentiment, but it lays down no regenerating law.

Is this audacious? Then is the author of "Ecce Homo" audacious; for he says, "To make the New Testament, or the precepts of apostles, or the special commands of Christ, the Christian law, is to throw the Church back into the legal system from which Christ would have set it free."

The spirit of the West is not sentimental. It is scientific. It takes the world as it is. It studies the facts of human nature, the facts of life. It observes, compares, searches, thinks, reasons; puts cause and effect, sequence and consequence, together; adapts means to ends; matches agencies with results. It neither sees visions nor dreams dreams. It says not much about the kingdom of heaven, but is satisfied to talk of reform and improvement. It does not dwell in anticipations of paradise. If it can make things a little better, it is content. It has no ideal men and women. It jumps at no conclusions in regard to human possibility. It has enough to do with answering questions as they are asked, and dealing with problems as they are propounded. It is not burning, or enthusiastic, or glowing; its countenance does not smile in light from the mountains of the dawn. Serious it is, and sad, and perhaps a little severe. But its activity is incessant, and its earnestness is profound.

It has its ideal, too; a state of society ordered in accordance with the laws of economy; a state of society in which the liberty of the individual shall be reconciled with general harmony and peace; which shall give to each one his rights, and to all

their development; which shall see interest balance interest, faculty assist faculty, principle play into principle. But it seeks to attain this beautiful state by ideas, not by feelings; by laws, not by sentiments. It works on a principle, and that principle is *justice*; not love, but justice, which is the prose of love; cold, austere justice, men call it; merciless, pitiless, fearless, heartless justice,—justice, blindfolded, that she may not be moved by the agony on suffering faces, or the tears in weeping eyes; justice, bearing in one hand the scales that weigh deeds to the nicety of a hair, in the other hand bearing a sword, to cut hapless offenders off from the earth. No, no! I do not accept the picture. That is the old Greek image, not the new human one. Our justice, the justice of modern ethics,—rational justice, scientific justice, social justice,—is a very different figure. Her eyes are unbandaged. They never close. They look through the night. They see what goes on in the darkness. With telescopic and microscopic vision they search the secrets of men. In her left hand are the scales, delicately hung; but she will not allow herself to be cheated by gross weight; she will know what is thrown into them, and who throws it. She weighs quality, motive tendency, spirit, as well as bulk. No sword does her right hand carry. She hates violence as cordially as the divinity of love does. She will do nothing by force. The spirit of vengeance, the thought of retribution, is not in her. She carries no sword; but neither does she carry the idle olive branch, pretty enough as a symbol of peace attained, but worse than useless as an instrument for attaining peace. It is a *measuring wand* she bears, as a sign that all things, institutions and codes, men and governments, all human relations and characters, of whatever order and kind, must conform to the same fair but unchanging rule. Justice, tender as tenderness, strong as strength, righteous as righteousness, pitiful as pity,—this is the principle on which modern ethics proceed. The fair thing; the honest; the equitable thing; the wise and salutary thing; the thing that is due. "*Every one according to his need*," is the motto of sentiment. "*Every one according to his meed*," is the motto of science. Sentiment says, "Have you a sorrow?" Science asks, "Have you a claim?" "What do you desire?" asks sentiment. "What

do you deserve?" asks science. "What have you suffered?" inquires sentiment. "What have you done?" demands science. "What *can* you do? Where do you belong? Show me your contribution? What are you good for? What use can you be put to?" Searching questions, such as the idle, the weak, the foolish, do not like to answer; questions that bring us all up on our feet, and set us to weighing rights against duties. The aim of modern ethics is not to *soothe* people in their misery, but to *rescue* them from it; not to *comfort* them in their sorrow, but to make them *masters* of their sorrow. It is not *philanthropic*: it is *human*. It has no specially tender regard for any specially afflicted classes: it has a noble regard for all classes. It is wanting, let us confess, in the romantic virtues of confidingness, gentleness, simplicity, prodigality, renunciation, sacrifice, that look so attractive in the stories of old-world charity. But it lifts up into prominence one power of which the old-world charity knew nothing, which the New Testament does not mention, which is not so much as suggested in the Sermon on the Mount: and that power is *the law of liberty*; a power whose beneficence, if not so touching as that of love, is far more copious and extended. It wrings a benediction from the wretched, as soon as they begin to feel the blood of a new purpose coursing through their veins and the throbbing in their hearts of a new virtue, called self-respect and self-reliance. It is the *great* giver, for it gives men their souls. It is the *great* lover, for it loves them, not on the surface of their existence, but down to the very roots of their being; loves them so faithfully, that it will not be satisfied till it has made them love manhood and womanhood *in themselves*.

That this new morality of science has as yet achieved any remarkable victories in society, I do not claim. It is as yet in its infancy. But a small portion of mankind have come to it. The Christian world still professes the ethics of sentiment, and they cloud its vision while they do not mend its practice. The believers in the new system are themselves not wholly committed to it, but are trammelled by the associations of the sentimental code. Strength is wasted in the effort to make the two theories work together, and this again embarrasses action. If

all who act on the new theory would openly avow it, the work of regeneration would be, oh, how much easier! For the spirit of the age is stronger than we are, and all of those who work to some purpose now work on the new principle. It is getting into our homes, our charities, our beneficent institutions and social reforms, our legislation, our sanitary provisions, and our public justice. It brings new agencies to bear against old evils. Where sentiment failed it tries common sense. Where sympathy was feeble, it tries reason. Where love proved ineffectual, it tries knowledge. And the old iniquities *confess* the new enemy. The Sermon on the Mount accused them of inhumanity, and they went on. Science accuses them of folly, and they pause. War, slavery, intemperance, licentiousness, the gallows, tyranny, the spirit of caste, huge social antipathies between races, classes, sexes, — those gigantic barbarians, who walked through the precepts of the gospel as an elephant walks through cobwebs in the grass, — stop and think whether their blind *absurdity* is worth what it costs. Brought face to face with the Beatitudes, they laughed. Brought face to face with prudence and interest, with health and wealth, they hang their heads. They dared be cruel and savage; they dare not be stupid and idiotic. They never hesitated to perpetrate crimes. They think twice before they commit blunders.

We have spent all our time in giving an exposition of these two schemes of commandment, wishing to make it perfectly clear and convincing. We could spend as much more time in commending the new method for its advantages. But these must speak their own eulogy. Their deeds will give them voice. They need no spoken praise. All they ask is that their disciples will be true to them, at home, abroad, writing, talking, acting; that they will lay passion by, put feeling in the background, consider, judge, be satisfied to be simply and nobly just. For to be that is to be kind and tender, past the words of Jesus himself to express. The path of the just alone is as the shining light that shineth more and more unto the perfect day.

O. B. FROTHINGHAM.

BOUND OR NOT BOUND?

HOW often it occurs that the full import of words is not comprehended by him who utters them. Sometimes they contain thoughts hundreds of years in advance of the age in which they are spoken. Meant, perhaps, to support a given theory, they are at some distant day discovered to be the strongest weapons against it; or, originally used for the purpose of attacking some opinion, they are afterwards found to be the most efficient means of defending it. One would hardly expect in a letter like the so-called second Epistle of Paul to Timothy, written late in the second century, for the evident purpose of combating the heresies of the Gnostics, for the purpose of consolidating as far as possible the various Christian communities, and of increasing and confirming the already growing power of the overseers of the church,—in a letter which commands the person to whom it is addressed to “hold fast to *the form of sound words*,” which he had heard from the writer,—a letter which attaches as much importance to the sacred writings, and which so magnifies the office of Christ, to find it asserted in plain language that “the word of God is *not bound*.” The word of God not bound? Why, the very thing the writer was attempting to do was to bind it. In the first age of the church, it is true, the word of God had been free; at least to a very large extent; and the very man upon whom this clumsy forgery of a later age is foisted, Paul, was the one above all others who defended that freedom. How can any man in his senses, who reads Paul’s letter to the Galatians,—the oldest Christian document now in our possession,—with its indignant denunciations of those who “stole in to spy out the freedom” of his churches and bring them again into bondage, with its marked contempt of the immediate disciples of Jesus, men who “seemed to be somewhat,” who put on airs, as we should say, and thought they had the exclusive right to control the affairs of the church, with its pity for those who are still in bondage to the “weak and beggarly

elements" of the law; or, how can any man who reads Paul's first letter to the Corinthians, and sees how he encouraged the whole church to preach and prophesy, on condition that it be done in order, and result in mutual edification, and thus sees that the word of God was not bound to any particular class of men, but was a common and universal inspiration,—how can any one, who knows anything at all of the real and historical career of Paul or of his opinions, believe for a moment that he could have written such letters as the so-called "Pastoral Epistles"? or that they could have been written in the first age of the church at all? The word of God was not bound, but it was not long before men sought to bind it. To have continued to acknowledge the universal priesthood, as it obtained in the earliest right of all to teach, would have been utterly fatal to the growth churches, the inspiration of all Christians, and the consequent of any hierarchical power whatsoever within the church. The "liberty of prophesying" gradually became intolerable to the growing church; for where everybody was invited to express himself, differences of opinion, even in regard to what was considered essential, were unavoidable. Then, too, the original character of Christianity left room for endless speculation. Starting with the simple belief in Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah of the Jews, produced by the lofty morality of his teachings and the imposing grandeur of his own moral personality, and that too, in direct opposition to all traditional and preconceived opinions as to the character of that Messiah, it became immediately necessary to reconcile the contradiction between the Messiah as he in reality was, and what men expected him to be. Jesus had indeed proved himself to be a hero; but men had expected a hero of another sort. The Jews were groaning under the galling yoke of Rome; they were yearning and praying and hoping for deliverance; expecting a mighty conqueror who should come to break the rod of the oppressor,—a scion of the house of David, who should come to restore the kingdom, to re-establish and increase its power, and rule over the hated Gojien thenceforth and forever. But there came a poor, humble carpenter; a man with horny hands, from a despised district; with no outward show,

no armed followers ; with no personal presence, and nothing to recommend him : and this man stood up in the synagogues and the market-places, by the roadside and the seaside, wherever he could gain the ear of the people, and taught them the simple truths of morality and religion, of love to God and love to man ; and though not insensible to the political condition of his people, longing with the rest of them for freedom, taught them, nevertheless, not to be continually looking ahead for the coming of the kingdom of God, but to look rather into their own hearts ; telling them that the kingdom of God was really there, and not elsewhere, if they only chose to find it and to make it ; telling them also that the new order of things, which they were so impatient to inaugurate, had already come, although not with outward pomp and circumstance ; that it was already there among them, a germ enfolding mighty issues.

Disappointed as to the manner of his first appearing, men nevertheless came to believe that this man was the intended deliverer of Israel, and would yet be recognized as such by means of some miraculous interposition of God in his favor, — a belief which he himself seems to have shared. But when at last he perished as a malefactor, at the hands of the very power he was expected to overthrow, his fate seemed for the moment to be utterly irreconcilable with any belief in his Messiahship. Then it was that his immediate disciples, who had been too powerfully impressed by his intrinsic greatness and goodness, and whose hopes had been too completely bound up in him to make it possible for them to give him up, were driven to the inference that men had hitherto been wholly mistaken as to the character and career of the promised Messiah. From this moment they began to look on the Hebrew Scriptures with different eyes, and to interpret them, not in accordance with what men had previously expected, but in accordance with what had really happened, and with the expectations which had grown up out of that. Disappointed at the course of events thus far, and cut off from the traditions of their people, they were afloat on the ocean of speculation.

Here it was that Christian theology took its rise. The fundamental belief was the belief in the second and immediate coming of Christ for the purpose of restoring the kingdom to Israel,

Jesus was the Messiah, but to the Jews exclusively; he had come "to seek and to save the lost sheep of the house of Israel:" whoever wished to become a partaker in the glory of his kingdom must be converted to the national religion of the Jewish people. So, in the first stage of Christianity, *the word of God was bound to the Jews*. They were the mediate source of all truth, and of the salvation of the human race.

Paul was the first man to enter a protest against this narrowness and exclusiveness, against any limitation of the Christianity to a particular race or nation. Christ was to him the redeemer and regenerator of the world, not mediately through the Jews, but immediately by a change wrought in the inward disposition of all who believed in him. He himself, as *the ideal man*, "the second Adam," "the Lord from heaven," was the power unto salvation, and so *the word of God became bound to Jesus*; not however, that simple man Jesus who had been a carpenter in Nazareth, but to "Christ Jesus the Lord." Here we have the element of freedom and the element of slavery combined,—freedom from all petty national limitations, and yet subjection to the authority of a half historical, half mythico-theological person. Paul's instinct was towards the utmost freedom; but the prejudices of his education, much as he struggled against them, forced their way into his system of theology. Jewish particularism, kicked violently out of doors, crept in again at the window unobserved. For it makes but little essential difference whether the world is dependent for salvation on a single nation, or on a single historic individual. And it was, doubtless, a dim perception, a half-consciousness of this truth, that impelled Paul, in rejecting the Jewish-Christian view of Christianity, to take Jesus out of the sphere of simple humanity, and make him the primitive typical man, the ideal of the human race.

But speculation in regard to the person of Jesus and the nature of his mission was not to end here. So long as there was liberty to speculate there must be liberty to advance. After the middle of the second century the doctrine of Paul assumed a higher potency; Jesus was no longer originally a human being, but the divine Logos, existing from all eternity,—not yet God himself, but the next thing to it. The doctrine

concerning Christ was gradually crystallizing into that intricate and artificial system of theology which afterwards became the faith of the universal church. So too, the church itself was gradually becoming an organized body of believers. For many centuries nothing but an aggregation of independent communities (churches), these finally became fused into the one, universal, falsely so-called apostolic church. Unity in church government necessitated unity in doctrine; the universal priesthood became a thing of the past; the primitive liberty of prophesying and teaching was circumscribed by limits, which grew narrower and narrower, until in the embrace of the hierarchy it was finally extinguished. There were no longer allowable differences of opinion within the church; for all who chose to think contrary to her infallible teachings were "heretics" and "outsiders," fit only to be exterminated from the earth. *The word of God was bound to the church*, and the salvation of mankind dependent on her mediation. In the primitive age Christ became the vicegerent of God; now the church, with the Pope as her visible head, had become the vicegerent of Christ. The state was her puppet and man her slave.

Century after century rolled on, and the power of the Roman hierarchy knew no limit, until one day, in the first quarter of the sixteenth century, there rose up in the heart of Germany a poor monk, who was destined to free mankind from this thralldom of ages. But the fetters which it had taken a millennium to rivet were not to be broken over night. In the beginning, at least, one form of tyranny was supplanted by another. The external authority of the church was exchanged for the semi-external authority of the Bible. A certain latitude of interpretation was, in the beginning, allowed; but the limits were contracted more and more, until the precise sense in which the Bible was to be understood was fixed in the formal and authorized "Confessions of Faith." With Luther, as with Paul, the instinct was for the largest liberty; but, in spite of all his endeavors, he could not divest himself of prejudices, which he had sucked in with the milk of the mother church. At first, Christ, the vicegerent of God; then the church, in her visible head, the vicegerent of Christ; and now the Bible, the authoritative regulator and ruler

of the church and of all human thought and action. And so *the word of God became bound to the Bible*, to the letter of the Hebrew and Christian Scriptures. This was the last deposit, the highest potency, of dogmatism.

Here we have in a nutshell the history of the Christian church down to the middle of the last century, at which time the dissolution of all outward authority in spiritual matters began. Men saw that it was essentially the same thing, whether one made the eternal welfare of man dependent on a single nation, a single individual, a church, or a book. They saw that each and all of them had been helps in the moral and religious and intellectual development of mankind, and might still continue to be, but only on condition of their assuming the relation of friends instead of masters.

It is as children and representatives of this great movement that we assert, in the face of the whole organized Christian church, Catholic and Protestant, that *the word of God is not bound at all*.

1. *The word of God is not bound to the church.* There is no outward, visible organization which represents infallibly the will of God towards man. There is no organization which has been exclusively entrusted with the custody and care of souls. There is no organization which is the medium of communication between God and man. There is no organization which is the exclusive channel of divine inspiration. None which can lay claim to special divine institution. All specific organizations are of strictly human origin, the outgrowth of specific human needs, subject to the laws of historic development; and they will perish when those needs are no longer felt. The Word of God is the sum of truth and the norm of physical and moral action, immanent in nature and in man, and so at the same time the will of God. And as there is no organization which represents and embodies the sum of truth, or presents the infallible norm of moral action, so there is none in which all the intellectual, moral and religious needs of man are recognized and can be gratified. There is no church, actual or possible, capable of exhausting the height and the depth, the riches and the glory, of the universe. There is none, actual or possible, which could have, or acquire, the right to set a limit to the intellect, the conscience, in a word,

the soul of man, in any direction whatever. There is no church, actual or possible, into whose hands man dare put the keeping of his soul. The soul is above all churches.

2. *The word of God is not bound to the Bible.* There is no book which is the exclusive depository of the will of God. There is no book which is not human and fallible, none which was exempt from the conditions of human authorship, or preserved from the accidents of history. There is no book, or collection of books, which contains any *special* revelation of God, and of his purposes as regards the human race. There is no book which embodies the sum of truth, or presents an infallible norm of morals, applicable to all the relations and to all the possible emergencies of human life. The Bible is *a part* of the record of the spiritual history of man up to near the close of the second century, after the birth of Jesus, and as such of the highest value, yes, invaluable. It contains the seeds of much which has grown up through the centuries into rare and beautiful fruit, and of much which will bear glorious fruit in future. It contains the germs also of some things which grew up to poison history and human life. It is filled with some of the grandest and loftiest experiences of man, full of the history of his trials and triumphs, and of his downfall and disgrace, full of matchless poetry and marvelous insights, of touching episodes and warning examples, of fiery rebuke and tender admonition, of lessons for high and low, rich and poor, for the child and the full-grown man; full of aspiration, of comfort, and encouragement,—it is the book of books. But it is neither God's first word nor his last. His word is written all over the universe and on every page of history, and is a continual revelation from day to day and from age to age. The Bible is not a finality. The soul is greater than any book.

3. *The word of God is not bound either to the Jesus of history or to the Christ of theology.* The whole of truth has never been revealed to any individual, either in science, in morals, or in religion. The individual is always partial and imperfect. This is a necessity of psychology and of history,—a necessity of his nature. In the realm of mind progress is the rule. Every child learns from its parents, and every age from the one that pre-

ceded it. No man has appeared who has exhausted even a single department of science, or embodied the ideal perfection in his life. Humanity is greater than any man. The sum of knowledge and the sum of virtue belong not to the individual, but to the race. No one man can be the absolute norm for another.

"Each man is some man's servant ; every soul
Is by some other's presence quite discrowned ;
Each owes the next through all the imperfect round,
And yet with mutual help, each man is his own goal,
And the whole world must stop to pay his toll."

Slowly the world advances from age to age, gathering into its bosom the treasures of the past, and History points, with reverent finger, to the great names which blaze upon her page, and in the greatness of her gratitude she sometimes calls them "*saviours*" of the race. But history knows nothing of the fall of man, of vicarious suffering, of imputed merit, or of any of the great dogmas which compose the ecclesiastical system of theology. She knows nothing of special incarnations of Deity, nothing of special miraculous revelations of truth.

"Great truths are portions of the soul of man ;
Great souls are portions of Eternity :
Each drop of blood, that through true heart ran
With lofty message, ran for thee and me ;
For God's law, since the starry song began,
Hath been, and still forevermore must be,
That every deed which shall outlast Time's span
Must goad the soul to be erect and free.

* * * * *

Upward the soul forever turns her eyes ;
The next hour always shames the hour before :
One beauty, at its highest, prophesies
That by whose side it shall seem mean and poor. .
No God-like thing knows aught of less and less,
But widens to the boundless Perfectness."

THOMAS VICKERS.

THE SCARLET OAK IN WINTER.

NOW darkly stands the elm defined
In leafless lines against the sky,
And loudly in the winter wind
The naked birch and maple sigh.
The oak-leaves feel the biting blast,—
Their dark, enameled green is gone ;
But still they're clinging, clinging fast,
Their native gnarlèd boughs upon.

With them commixed, the solar beam
Turns to the russet of their hue,
So sweetly blended one could deem
That with the leaf the sunlight grew.
And many a dazzling winter noon
On them I muse a silent hour ;
See worth endowed with beauty's boon,
And sweet grace born of chastened power.

Brave oak ! the proud and prosperous pine
May rear his coronal of cones :
Green are his robes, all sere are thine ;
Husky thy note, how grand his tones !
But Nature's holiest mystery
Is shrined in thy crisp, clinging leaves ;
She makes thee rich by poverty,
And blèsses most when she bereaves.

Winter hath not a sight so dear
As this brown oak-tree to mine eye :
It fills my heart with steadfast cheer ;
I would not wish, I could not sigh.
Surpassing scope of speech or thought,
A Life, a Presence, 'tis to me :
Art thou with kindred quickening fraught,
A sturdier brother, brown oak-tree ?

THE SUEZ CANAL.

WHEN Columbus, under the shadows of the Alhambra, in Spain of romantic history, intuitively divined a connecting link, which he supposed to be a strait of water between the Atlantic and Pacific, and marked out to Isabella on an imperfect chart the spot where he thought the strait ought to be, he designated the situation of the isthmus of Panama, where the existence of a narrow neck of land, instead of the strait for which Columbus looked, constitutes one of the chief barriers to the communication of men with each other. The other barrier, equally important, was the isthmus of Suez, through which the great ship-canal has now cut a highway for the nations. In November last, with the pomp of courts and the presence of kings and queens, with consecration of Christian church and Mohammedan mosque, with Arab horse-exercises, with cannon, dancing, fireworks, sermon and prayer, the canal was opened to a stately procession of vessels which passed through its noble channel.

The isthmus is a neck of land about one hundred miles wide, connecting Egypt in Africa with Arabia in Asia, and separating the Mediterranean Sea at its extreme eastern boundary from the Red Sea which lies between Arabia and Egypt, and is connected with the Indian Ocean by the strait of Bab-el-mandeb. From this geographical position it was evident that, if a canal capable of floating great ships should be cut across the isthmus, a very direct route would be obtained to India, and save the great commerce which seeks the islands and shores of the Indian Ocean from the wearisome and often dangerous journey around the Cape of Good Hope.

This great work, the magnitude of which I shall try to describe, found a great man to shoulder it. Great works always find great men—or make them. This man was Ferdinand De Lesseps, who first urged the work with decision, and devoted himself to it until he carried it through triumphantly, under

manifold difficulties and discouragements. And though the time needed it and demanded it, as he himself says, yet none the less is the canal a manifestation of De Lesseps' soul; and his heart, like Winstanley's in his lighthouse, is built into "the courses of its wall." He is now about sixty-five years old, having been born at Versailles in 1805. Many years of his life have been passed in the diplomatic service of France, which he has both served and adorned; and his courageous and vigilant care of his countrymen at the bombardment of Barcelona, by Espartero, not only procured him the gratitude of his own country and a place in the Legion of Honor, but filled Europe with his praises, and gained him insignia from Sardinia, Sweden, Holland, the Two Sicilies, and even Spain. This same fervor of will and enthusiasm of conviction the great "ditch-digger"—as the English persisted in calling him, derisively—carried into the enterprise of the Suez Canal. "*J'ai pour principe de commencer par avoir la confiance*," he said,—My principle from the beginning was to have confidence. Time and reflection he considered his chief machinery: they "must be the best elements of success," he says; and the delicacy which led him to refrain carefully from seeking the special co-operation of his government, in order that the international and universal character of the great enterprise might not be in the least compromised, showed him to be a fit head for a work requiring so many stores of patience and determination, as well as skill and tact, in dealing with his many thousands of workmen of different nationalities.

It must not be thought, however, that the idea of the canal originated with De Lesseps. His was the enthusiasm and courage which brought it to pass. Like other great ideas, its beginning or first inception is lost in antiquity. Perhaps there was a mind in which the thought first dawned; perhaps it was a national inspiration and flashed on a people at once. But no one can find its beginning. Space forbids what could be made very interesting,—a history of the canal-idea on the isthmus from the most remote mention of it down to its culmination in the present mighty achievement. A canal existed, described by Herodotus, uniting the Red Sea to the Nile, and so to the Mediterranean, executed by the Pharaohs; which (although once

fallen into decay) Strabo, a little before the Christian era, saw again filled with vessels, it having been restored and enlarged by the Ptolemies. This was further enlarged and deepened by the Roman Emperor Hadrian, and, having again fallen into ruin, was restored by Amrou after the Arabian conquest of Egypt in the seventh century: it finally fell into neglect and disuse about the ninth century, but was again revived as a plan by Napoleon, who first discovered near Suez the remains of the ancient canal, and, after exploring the isthmus himself, committed the subject to Lepère, an engineer of distinction, with orders to prepare a *mémoire* upon the junction of the Red and Mediterranean Seas by a canal. Lepère suggested in effect the restoration of the ancient canal. This was also entertained as a desirable plan by Mehemet-Ali; and from 1840 to 1853 various different plans were suggested for accomplishing the junction, which were mainly founded on the old plan of joining the Red Sea with the Nile; although in 1841 and 1846 two abortive attempts were made to take in hand a direct cut through the isthmus, from sea to sea. Lepère considered the direct cut possible, but so difficult as to be impracticable; and this view was largely due to considering the Red Sea to be thirty feet higher than the Mediterranean,—an antique error which was exposed in 1847 and the two seas proved to be on nearly an exact level. It is a remarkable fact that, when Lepère announced a difference of thirty feet, Fourier and La Place, without any engineering proof, and without any specific means of disproving the surveys of Lepère, on merely theoretical grounds concerning the distribution and equilibrium of large bodies of water, refused to credit the alleged difference, and declared it impossible,—a scientific penetration which more exact surveys sustained.

From this brief review, it is plain that De Lesseps has the right to claim, as he does, that his canal-idea was the first one which contemplated, seriously and enthusiastically, the mighty work of a ship canal a hundred miles in length, cut directly through a desert, to mingle the waters of two seas, and realize the motto which he prefixed to his first report on the subject, "*Aperire terram gentibus.*" The idea lay in his mind as long ago as 1852; but it was in 1854, during a journey with the Viceroy

of Egypt, Said-Pacha, from Alexandria to Cairo, across the Libyan Desert, that Lesseps broached his plan to the prince, and the two discussed its captivating glories. Said enjoined his friend (for a friendship of twenty years lay behind their union in this great work) to present to him a *mémoire* or report upon the subject, which De Lesseps wrote at once in the midst of the desert, and presented to the prince in a few days an enthusiastic statement of the possibility and advantages of the contemplated work. Said at once gave De Lesseps a concession, empowering him to form a canal-company, based on universal participation and perfect impartiality among the nations, which thus made the isthmus an international possession for ninety-nine years (the term of the land grant), and, as De Lesseps expresses it, "made the new road between the hemispheres the equal domain of all peoples." De Lesseps was then directed to make a thorough survey of the isthmus, and submit a provisional plan of the canal; and for this purpose two able engineers were placed under his orders, who at once began their work, guided by the most minute instructions of De Lesseps as to the subjects to which they must give attention (*v. Percement de L'Isthme De Suez*, p. 61, *seq.*); and in two months they returned a remarkable report called the "*Avant-projet*" (*Ibid* p. 67, *seq.*) It makes a volume of one hundred and forty-eight 8vo. pages, discussing with extraordinary vigor the history of the canalization of the isthmus from the earliest times; the level of the two seas; the geological questions involved; the action of rivers and seas in forming sand-bars, and its special application to the Mediterranean; the best trace for the canal; the proper dimensions for it; the Gulf of Pelusium; the jetties needed for the artificial harbor there; Suez and its harbor; the work of cutting; the objections to the work founded on difficult navigation of the Red Sea, on the sand-drifts, on the difficulty of navigating a canal by steam, and on the probable opposition of England; the fresh water canal from the Nile, to be built as a subsidiary to the ship canal, and to supply the workmen and the towns along the route with fresh water; and finally the financial aspects of the enterprise.

Armed with this thorough document, De Lesseps proceeded at once to Constantinople to obtain the approbation of the sul-

tan, which was delayed and embarrassed by the opposition and jealousy of England expressed, through its ambassador, Lord Stratford. Thence he quickly returned to Europe, and repaired to England to counteract the unfriendliness of that nation towards the project, issuing for that purpose, in London, an edition of the principal documents upon the question. Meantime, the 19th May, 1855, the Viceroy of Egypt, acting on some friendly and approving remarks in a letter of the sultan's grand vizier, instructed De Lesseps to forward the enterprise by the appointment of an international commission, to be composed of the foremost hydraulic engineers of all countries, to whom should be submitted the "*Avant-projet*" of the Egyptian engineers, and who should be provided with the means of visiting Egypt and studying the subject on the spot. This commission, gathered from France, England, Holland, Austria, Italy, Prussia, and Spain, met in Paris in October of the same year, and repaired at once to the isthmus, where they spent nearly two months in a thorough study of the question, going over again all the work of the two Egyptian engineers (Linant-Bey and Moguel-Bey). Upon a summary report of this commission, presented Jan. 5, 1856, Said confirmed his previous concession and authorized De Lesseps to proceed at once to organize the "*Compagnie Universelle du Canal Maritime de Suez*." "However," says De Lesseps, "I was unwilling yet to profit by this authority, preferring to wait the moment when the publication of the complete report of the international commission, the prosecution of studies and researches still continuing in the isthmus of Suez, the result of commercial inquiries which I purposed to make in the principal cities of Europe, and of discussions which I should solicit, should completely enlighten public opinion." When the report was published, all the scientific and commercial societies of Europe were invited to examine it; and from St. Petersburg to Italy and Greece, the press and journals of science and art waxed warm in the discussion, while De Lesseps proceeded again to England, Ireland, and Scotland, held meetings for discussion in London, Liverpool, Manchester, Dublin, Cork, Belfast, Glasgow, Edinburgh, and many other towns, and published in English and French a

volume of reports of the doings of eighteen meetings and the resolutions adopted. He then returned to Constantinople, whither he was summoned by the continued resistance of English diplomacy, which urged the sultan to delay his formal consent. This resistance was carried on actively by the English cabinet, in spite of noble speeches denouncing it made by Gladstone in the House of Commons, and by Lord John Russell, and in spite of D'Israeli's cunning and rather mean rejoinder, that no proofs had been shown of any such interference, and that the House ought not to try to influence public opinion upon such an important enterprise. Palmerston confessed in the House of Commons that the government had done all in its power for fifteen years to crush the enterprise. This English jealousy, which has treated the work sometimes with derision, sometimes with active hostility, from its beginning to the present time, arose in selfishness and fear lest England's supremacy in India might be threatened, or her commercial pre-eminence lessened, as well as in other still narrower jealousies concerning her influence in Egypt. It was simply that she was hostile to a work which she was afraid would benefit others more than herself; and her use of the sultan as a tool was especially contemptible, because, when her own railroad interests in Egypt were at stake, England had contended previously that in internal works of improvement Egypt was independent of Turkey. But it is fair to distinguish between that noble people and their selfish government, as De Lesseps does, though smarting under their opposition, in language which betrays his sense of the deeper than monetary aspects of his great scheme. "Public opinion," he says, "more clear-sighted, gives a lesson to the statesmen which they will do well to profit by. It sees more justly than they in a question which is, at least, as much moral as material" (*Percement de L'Isthme de Suez, Deuxieme Serie*, p. 55). To the ministers of state, however, I must add the ministers of religion, the clergymen, who opposed the grand scheme with their usual stupidity and backwardness where anything new is concerned. English writers conjured up all sorts of difficulties: the navigation of the Red Sea was perilous; even for steamers the canal would be useless, because the passengers and

merchandise could be transhipped more quickly and cheaply by railroad from Suez to Alexandria, and steam vessels would wear away the sides of the canal by the waves caused by them; it was impossible to make a channel large enough for the ships then building; even if executed and large enough, the effect on trade would be very small; but not only could it not be used, advantageously or otherwise, but it could not even be made, it being quite certain that the sands of the desert would be sifted in by the wind as fast as they could be dug out. It was in vain that engineers and mariners declared the Red Sea safely navigable, the winds and currents favorable on the whole, the banks easily to be protected against washing away, the saving of distance (nearly or quite half), expense, and trouble of transshipment, so great as to compel trade to seek that channel, and the desert sands so still that foot-prints remain for months unobliterated,—still Englishmen regarded it as French nonsense, until the logic of success set its crown upon it: then the English papers began to talk of wanting no better favor at Suez than that free competition which had availed them so well in the cape route, and English shipbuilders went to work on vessels specially designed for employment on the canal.

Being thus hindered by English resistance, De Lesseps determined to place the enterprise at once on a financial basis, so as to create interests which would justify the interference of other governments against England. He made a rapid tour of inspection through Europe, hastily visited Egypt and Constantinople, and then opened his subscription lists all over Europe and America, and in Turkey and Egypt, on the 5th Nov., 1858. In less than a month the capital was all subscribed, the company was organized at Paris the twentieth of December, proceeded at once to explore and survey the isthmus; and, early in 1859, De Lesseps planted the Egyptian flag on the coast where Port-Said now stands, laid the foundation-stone for a lighthouse, struck the first blow with the pickaxe, and proclaimed the work begun.

Let us take a rapid glance at what has been accomplished from that time up to this hour. The Isthmus of Suez has a remarkable depression or valley, running the whole distance between Suez on the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, caused by the in-

tersection of the planes of lines of hills on both the Egyptian and Arabian sides. In this depression, which only in three places rises much above the level of the Mediterranean, there are four bodies of water, — two deep lakes, a shallow lake, and a vast lagoon called Lake Menzaleh, which is separated from the Mediterranean only by a cordon of sand one or two hundred yards in width, through which are several openings into the sea which were formerly mouths of the Nile, and which are now kept open by the tide flowing in and out. It has been thought that in prehistoric times the two seas were naturally united, and that what is now an isthmus was then a strait; but though the configuration of the land invites this hypothesis, the fauna of the two seas, though they have been traced to within a few miles of each other in the sand, have never been found mingled (Henry Mitchell, in "North American Review," October, 1869), and so the hypothesis of ancient connection lacks physical confirmation. Directly through this depression or valley, which seems as if designed by nature for such a work, the canal has been dug and dredged, about one hundred miles long, from sea to sea, without any lock, over three hundred feet wide, and twenty-six feet deep below the mean level of the sea. At lake Timsah, which lies about the middle of the isthmus, another natural depression runs off at right angles to the former one, and through this a fresh water canal has been dug connecting the lake with the Nile, and branching off near the lake to run southward to Suez, thus connecting the maritime canal with the internal navigation of Egypt. In 1862 the waters of the Mediterranean flowed into Lake Timsah, a distance of fifty miles. As the ancient canal had reached this point or near it, this was the only part which had never been dug before, and the successful accomplishment of the work could be viewed as definitely settled. Twenty-four dredges had demonstrated by their results that the oozy bottom of Lake Menzaleh was not an insurmountable obstacle. By the end of 1862, also, Port-Said numbered five hundred houses, and the company had lined the route from the Mediterranean to Lake Timsah with villages, hospitals, stores, chapels, mosques and workshops. In 1863 the fresh-water canal, pushed on by five thousand men, working night and

day for three months, when the moon afforded nocturnal light, was completed and inaugurated; and the Nile, a flowing gladness in its new channel, turned back, as it were, on its route to repair an omission, and knocked at the doors of Suez. In 1869 the company had established no less than eleven towns and villages as depots along the line of the canal, comprising a population of nearly twenty-five thousand, while the mechanics and laborers employed on the works raised the population of the isthmus to nearly forty thousand inhabitants; and the United States and all Europe, from Sweden to Greece, sent consuls or consular agents to the spot that was so miraculously teeming with universal interests. In February, 1868, the canal was opened for vessels of light draft, *via* the fresh-water canal and the Nile; and on Sunday, the 15th Aug. last (1869), the blow was struck which sent the waters of the Red Sea rushing to mingle with the Mediterranean, amid the acclamations of a joyful multitude; and now the great highway is open by the direct trace from sea to sea for large ships of commerce, while lighthouses and beacons of different kinds and colors throw their benign signal-rays along the channel of the canal, and from the Mediterranean coast of Egypt. Great machines have been invented which are wonders of science and art, whereby the mighty channel has been dredged through loose sands and bubbling ooze; and all this, and much more, for a cost, *as estimated originally*, not exceeding the monthly expense of the Crimean war. Among the eleven settlements before mentioned, two deserve special notice, Said and Ismailia, so called after the present viceroy, Ismail, and his predecessor, Said. Said is the port of the canal on the Mediterranean; it is built on the low cordon of sand that skirts the sea, an inhospitable belt on which has arisen, as if by magic, a town of ten thousand inhabitants, with bazaars, docks, machine-shops, hospitals, Christian chapels and a Mohammedan mosque, a convent, a theatre, markets, public baths, and schools; and iron pipes supply Nile water, brought fifty miles from the fresh-water canal. Gigantic moles or jetties, running one and a half miles and one mile respectively into the sea, built of immense blocks of artificial stone manufactured on the spot of hydraulic lime and sand, and requiring an exposure of three months in the air

in order to attain the requisite solidity, comprise between them a commodious and safe harbor of four hundred acres. In 1865 more than eighteen hundred vessels under fifteen different flags had visited the harbor; in 1869 the number reached three thousand; and twenty-four Austrian, Egyptian, French and Russian steam-packets touch regularly every month at the port.

Ismailia is the port on Lake Timsah, midway of the canal. In 1863 it consisted of two houses and a few sheds. Now it has three thousand inhabitants, and is adorned with handsome buildings,—the viceroy's palace, the offices of the company, a hotel, and others; the lake makes a splendid harbor, over twenty-five feet deep, and large enough to receive a whole fleet. Here, evidently, will be the great exchange of the canal, where will centre in a spacious basin the trade of East and West, and, by the fresh-water canal, much internal traffic in Egypt. De Lesseps says it is destined to be another Alexandria: and a traveler writes of it, "Should the canal succeed, this will become the grand harbor of Egypt; ships from the Indian seas and the far western Atlantic will meet on its waters; and Ismailia will be the emporium of the world. . . . Here the disunited waters of our hemispheres will for the first time, at least in the historic period, intermingle; and distant nations will be brought into easier communion, and dip their flags to each other in peace and good will."

But will the canal justify these proud anticipations? It is a great engineering triumph now; will it also be an equal commercial triumph? will it actually draw into its channel all, or much, of the trade which now doubles the cape? We cannot tell. But we know that the canal makes a saving of two thousand leagues, and perhaps of two months in five, between Europe and the extreme East: and this is ground for a great hope that the slender serpent of water now gliding through the desert may be the symbol of power, of glory, and a progressive civilization. Already it has had marked effects. France, Italy, Sardinia, Austria, and many towns and small states, long ago took authoritative steps to make ready to gain their share of the advantage. Even the pope appointed a commission of inquiry. Railroads in Italy and Sardinia are shown by official documents

to have arisen obedient to the approaching beck of the canal, nearly ten years before it was finished; and Venice has seen a chance to revive its ancient glory, and hastened to repair its docks, ports, and water-ways. Egypt has produced a company organized to bring the shores of the Red Sea into commercial relations, and develop the riches of Arabia and Eastern Africa. "Formerly," says the report of the French General Company of Steam Navigation, "Europe lived as a little world apart: now the world hastens to become European." The Suez Canal gives a foothold for peace; it has become a place to be numbered with the vital parts of all peoples: and all, great or little, are pledged by irresistible interests to maintain that pacific neutrality which is fundamentally pledged in the original constitutions of the company; and it is not too much to say, perhaps, with one writer, that, without the continual destructions and obstructions, caused by jealousy and prejudice, to which the canal has been subjected from the earliest times to the present, "the most favorable position would have dictated immutable laws, and the canal of the Red Sea would have been continually the base of the public law of nations." "War and commerce," says De Lesseps, "have civilized the world. War will have had its day after the supreme effort which we have in hand. Commerce alone will pursue its conquests." Through the great canal commerce will go (not the trade of great capitalists merely, but the business of small dealers and little states—for to shorten the voyage is to democratize navigation), to gather into popular centres of European civilization the scattered tribes of Arabia, to settle the wandering populations of the deserts in homes, to bring light and civilization into the darkness which envelopes the Mohammedan world, and open the interior of Africa to commerce and art. Egypt bids fair to become again what it was in ancient times, the chief highway of commerce; its geographical position is peculiarly advantageous, and its religious liberty, maintained for many years, forms a natural gateway for improvement. The moment political quiet and protection was attained in Egypt, its importance was proved by being at once opened to a transit trade by the English Railroad. Already the canal has had surprising effects upon it. Suez has increased from four thousand

or five thousand to twenty-five thousand inhabitants, and the Nile Canal, instead of trains of camels, supplies the city with fresh water. The climate of the isthmus is changing, — one of those stupendous facts which make us pause with awe as we think what human beings are and do. Deserts, where rain rarely or never fell, are now refreshed with showers. The fresh-water canal irrigates the soil, and large tracts, which were a little while ago arid wastes, are now gardens, generous with cotton and corn, and smiling with flowers; while Bedouin tribes have laid aside the spear, taken up the plow, and settled down to labor, — that most practical, but profound morality, — when beholding their deserts turning green and blossoming. The valley of the fresh-water canal, in the language of the engineers in the "*Avant-projet*," "will become again what it was in Scripture times, the land of Goshen, a name which signifies, in Hebrew and Arabic, *pasture lands*, and which Joseph gained from Pharaoh for the people of Israel, because it was the most fertile and salubrious region in Egypt."

The isthmus of Suez lies between Asia and Africa, and the canal has now brought Europe into fellowship. I see in this some symbol of the past, the present, and the future. Asia is the abode of the past of the whole human race so far as known to history; Europe is the home of our present civilization; and in the future stands Africa, waiting, expectant, submissive, reserved for some great way yet to praise the Lord.

The isthmus of Suez is historic ground for all the continents. Africa has been interested in it only or chiefly through Egypt; but Egypt to-day carries us back in its population to the time of the Pharaohs. It is neither Greek nor Turkish nor Arabian, but preserves mainly its ancient race and primitive type.

There seems a peculiar fitness in the great canal which incarnates our modern life and human solidarity traversing the soil which more than any other in the world is the dwelling-place of an inextinguishable national vitality. Egypt was old at the beginnings of all other peoples; she is so old that the world has not preserved a single monument of her youth, and, like the withered progeny of aged parents, she intimates a senile infancy. The most ancient records reveal a people already old in instruction. She was more than twenty-three dynasties old

when Rome was founded. Roman prowess, Assyrian empire, and Macedonian conquests passed by her like a scorching breath, soon exhaled. Yet her population of this day is neither Greek nor Turkish nor Arabian nor mongrel, but preserves, for the most part, its ancient race, and keeps close to the primitive type. Even the language survives. "There is every reason to believe that the native Christian population read their Bibles and preserve their hymns and religious books in the same tongue which was used in the days of the Pharaohs. It has not been in common use since the twelfth century; but it would seem that there were persons who could speak it as late as the seventeenth century" (Blackwood, Dec. 1869).

Asia has planted the sand of Suez with the flowering plants of our greatest and dearest traditions. From their native valleys of Palestine, the children of Israel settled there in the land of Goshen, which the fresh-water canal of De Lesseps is now bringing back to all its ancient fertility. Here, under Pharaoh's tyranny, they built the towns of Pithom, Rameses and Hon, whose traces still survive in the ruins of a great temple and of sculptures of Isis, Osiris, and Orus. The international commission encamped at Migdol or Magdalum, before which the Hebrews pitched their tents during the Exodus, and their route to the Red Sea and the wilderness beyond, in which their forty years' wanderings happened, lay across the desert of the isthmus. Tenis, Zoan, Bubastis, towns under different Egyptian dynasties, have all left their ruins on the soil. Pelusium, at which place it was first planned to make the Mediterranean port of the canal, was nine times taken, by Cambyzes, Xerxes, Artaxerxes, Antiochus, Octavius, and others, and three times unsuccessfully attacked, during a period reaching from nearly three thousand years B. C. to the Christian era; and Cleopatra, fleeing with Marc Antony from the victorious Octavius after the battle of Actium, tried, as if prophetically, to draw her vessels across the spot where the canal now runs, and to save them from the Romans by launching them into the Red Sea.

Europe set its foot in the isthmus and made it a Roman battle-ground; afterwards Asia resumed its interests there by the Arabian victories of Ameen, and Europe again returned with the legions and savants of Napoleon.

Over this historic ground, vibrating with the blows of the world's warlike history, runs the great water-way which is to be a channel of commercial peace; and along the route where the ancient canal was so many times made and destroyed for local pride or selfish fears, now flows the limpid witness of international enterprise and the unlimited community of human interests. Its flow is the *past*,—the moral and mental accumulations of the race, its spiritual capital, which is yet all unworked and unappreciated, like that Asia which typifies it,—on its way, which is the *present*,—the investing of capital in the glorious forms of peace, liberty, unshackled development, machinery, humane commerce, distribution of wealth, human rights, which are now leading the world in unquestioned majesty, like that political Europe whose mighty throes of revolution are the haggling of the bargainers and parties to the investment,—to the *future*, as *impenetrable as heaven*, which is typified by Africa, and now lies recumbent in its as yet unwaked wilds, as well as in the narcotized sleep of Asia. The sleeping beauty is hedged by dense tangles of matted ages of savage growth; but the prince is seeking her, drawn by the magic instinct of a destined love: he has cut through the outer barrier; he has found a broad highway; he will subdue other difficulties; cut away the inmost thicket of thorns, waken the princess with a kiss, yes, and wed her for the promised glory of her children, the polish of whose cultured eyes beam out softly from the recesses of the mother's wilder beauty. It is enough to say of the great canal that it opens a highway pledged to *peace*, gives peace a sallying-port whence it will not be slow to spread its beneficent power. What human beings may attain to, if we can have some centuries of perfect peace, not the most sanguine believer can conceive. But it may be permitted us to dream, even if perhaps it be but a dream, of Africa. When news came from Livingstone, Humboldt said it interested him most on account of its testimony to the capacity of the African race to receive and assimilate education. Who can for a moment estimate what that great continent may yet become. To future ages it may be the abode of the greatest current literature,—when German scholarship, French science, and English poetry are starry classics shining through the lunar halo of some thousands of years. Then Africa may be *résonant* with its tropic

cries of inarticulate nature subdued and rhythmically syllabled in poetry which will seem like exotics from the sun. Its children shall, perhaps, interpret the great poets in such an amazing drama as no temperate sky has ever looked down upon; and if the full music of the negro's soul could express in sound the gorgeous variety of the vegetable pageant around him and his own swarth figure therein, and the cries of the forest were attuned to inevitable harmony by an ear of kindred origin and sympathy, what music that would be! To conceive of this would be to reason with our imagination and chide it into comprehension of God's patience, which holds in loving equipoise the nebulae of a billion years till they gather into drops and sprinkle stars. "Westward the course of empire takes its way," has been the fact for many centuries, and many hundreds of centuries. It is for our time to see the circuit completed. Empire has surrounded the earth, and in its journeyings has become transmuted into liberty. Now it re-appears at the East. America holds out its hand to China from the Pacific, and from the Atlantic *via* the Pacific railroad. Europe stretches out directly to India; and civilization, the attainment of humanity, shall return to uplift and adorn the primeval dwelling-place of human traditions. Now a change takes place. Not the "course of empire," for "empire" is done; but *movement* turns towards the South, and emancipation paves the way. Hitherto commerce or trade has run east and west, for the most part, because trade has been the exchange of skilled and unskilled productions; and manufactures and skilled labor have of course followed in their development the western course of human movement. But this is an unnatural commerce. Trade between skilled and unskilled laborers means slavery for the unskilled. Such trade will always pay cheaply for the raw labor and charge dearly for the skilled production, so that, in extreme results, the poor drudge will have less and less control over the product of his labor, and drift into progressive dependence and servitude. The remedy is to make each community a self-supporting unit, save in those things which depend on climate. Manufactures are taking more and more a westward way; the natural tendency is to increase the variety of production every-

where to the utmost possible extreme, under the limitations of climate, so that there may be more commerce, which is the exchange of commodities by men for themselves, and less trade which is exchange effected by a man for other men (*v.* works of Henry C. Carey). Every community should do its own manufacturing of native and neighboring products, and the size of the community will adjust itself naturally by irresistible laws. The sum of happiness will not be reached till the West is rich in manufactures, and covered all over with furnaces and shafts, which shall catch the grime and sweat of the workman's face and spread it out to heaven in comely billows of handsome smoke, faced with the gleaming steam which has learned its fervid curves in the evolutions of machinery. When this is attained commerce will direct itself north and south, its natural channel, and, "subjected no longer to the fluctuations of varying skill, it will be based upon diversity of climate, which remains the same forever." Southward now the movement tends: commerce flies as a carrier-pigeon with a love-letter under its wing to the maiden of the south. And if she says "yes," children shall be born of her which shall show the strength of a severe training. If humanity succeeds, as it never has yet, in erecting itself into fair figure and strength in that tropical vegetation, which almost crowds out an enfeebled manhood, it will display a sinewy morality developed in fierce gymnastics; and in the crucible of the sun-baked will, all the obstinacy of earthy and alkaline difficulties shall be fused into agate and emeralds. Such a development may be hoped for Africa, as its original races become both developed and modified by many causes; and if such is to come, it has even now set out towards it, traveling on the water highway of Suez, — where freedom, in the persons of the Israelites, crossed into the wilderness and Palestine, there to flower in many prophet souls, and the soul of Jesus; thence to flow, in the inspiration and historic ferment proceeding from his career, though not without all mankind to aid it, around the world; till it returns to the point of its setting out, to make of it a road to fresh abodes and pastures new.

J. VILA BLAKE.

"LOST SINNERS."

THE claim made by orthodoxy of a right to acceptance, belief, and pecuniary support from the community, is founded upon the pretense that it teaches the way of salvation ; which claim, in its turn, rests on the pretense that salvation is needed.

The preachers and exhorters of this faith do not attempt to conceal the fact that they, like the people they address, are sinners ; and that they not only have been and are sinners, but expect to continue so to be as long as they live in this world. The distinction they insist upon is, that they, and a few hundreds of thousands of their sort, are *saved* sinners ; while all the rest of the community, and of the world, are *lost* sinners. Everybody—every one of the men, women and children of your acquaintance, reader—is lost, if he or she has not been saved. The method of this salvation is to agree to the terms set forth by the "evangelical church," as it calls itself ; and the essential characteristic of this sort of church, and the method of the proposed salvation, and the thing from which men are to be saved, are set forth in the following vote taken by the aggressive portion of that church, the last General Convention of "Young Men's Christian Associations :"—

"And we hold those churches to be evangelical which, maintaining the Scriptures to be the only infallible rule of faith and practice, do believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten of the Father, King of kings and Lord of lords, in whom dwelleth the fullness of the Godhead bodily, and who was made sin for us though knowing no sin, bearing our sin in his own body on the tree, as the only name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved from everlasting punishment."

The acceptance of this jumble of indefensible propositions is the way to be saved, and "everlasting punishment" is the thing which, they impiously say, has been prepared and appointed by God for every man and woman who does not receive them.

Instead of taking the trouble to examine the several parts of

the mass of unreasonable statements above quoted, it may be well to look at their foundation, — the assumption, without anything worthy for a moment to be called evidence, that the great majority of shopkeepers and housekeepers, and of the pupils of our grammar schools, normal schools, and colleges, are *lost sinners*, destined by God's arrangement for everlasting punishment, unless, before they leave this world, they "believe in" all the details above quoted.

The infallible Scriptures above referred to mention the worship of Moloch as well as that of Jehovah. Why is not Moloch worshiped now? Ask any member of an "evangelical church" this question. All he knows of Moloch is, that he was to be worshiped by burning little children alive; but this is quite enough to enable him to decide the question. Such a being, supposing him really to exist, would be *unworthy* of worship!

This is a just and right decision. The God who really devised and created men and women certainly gave them *reason* whereby to direct their course, and certain instincts of justice and humanity, in accordance with reason. On the testimony of these principles we decide, and rightfully decide, that Moloch is not the true God; and, further, that the representations of God made to us by the old Greek and Roman systems, by the Hebrew system, by the Brahminical system, by the Mohammedan system, are not true representations. Internal evidence, in each of these systems, forbids reasonable beings to believe that God is such as they declare him to be.

But are not the millions of believers in these systems also human beings, created, like ourselves, with natural directing powers of reason, justice, and humanity? If they have gone so far astray, how is it that we can be confident in the correctness of our own ideas?

The fundamental error of all these people has been, that, however they may have acknowledged the rightful authority of reason, justice, and humanity in other departments of life, they have systematically ruled them out of the department of religion. They have accepted their ideas of the character of God, and of their duty to him, by faith alone; by implicit trust in the assertions of a few living men, their religious teachers, that the tradi-

tions handed down from certain other men, long since dead, *must* be received as supremely and finally authoritative. It is through the blunder of receiving this impudent assumption as just and well-founded, that the majority of men and women now existing receive the systems of faith prevailing in their respective countries, not only without question, but without allowing themselves to *begin* the process of doubt by applying reason, justice, or humanity to the matter in question. They are taught that it is a sin to apply the *natural* method of inquiry, the method which the true God ordained in the very constitution of man, to a subject so sacred as religion! thus ruling that the power which God himself gave for man's direction may be used for things of moderate importance, but not for one of the highest importance! as if a shipmaster were allowed to use his rudder in the open sea, but forbidden to use it when near a reef!

Now, if those people who call themselves "orthodox" or "evangelical" (the great majority in our country) should apply to their own traditions concerning God the same rule by which they condemn the Greek and Roman, the Brahminical and the Mohammedan traditions, the result would be, that their image called Jehovah would plainly appear as unreal as the Jupiter or Pluto, the Vishnu or the Siva of the other forms of religion. If they should venture to assume that the true God, however mysterious, and in various respects above our comprehension, *cannot* be contrary in nature to those ideas of reason, justice and beneficence which he implanted in the hearts of men and made *natural* to them, their strangely manufactured and self-contradictory image called Jehovah would be shown unworthy of veneration and worship, as well as the Gentile gods above mentioned. Reason, justice, and humanity would condemn him, just as they condemn that other ancient image called Moloch.

But why should reason, justice, and humanity *not* be applied to the settlement of the religious question?

One of the devices of teachers of the "orthodox" system is to cry up "faith" as the appropriate substitute for these, where religion is concerned, and to stigmatize those who form their judgment on the rule above mentioned as having discarded faith. There could not be a greater mistake. Faith should co-operate

with reason, not conflict with it. The first, the plainest, the most unquestionably appropriate exercise of faith, is to believe well, and not ill, of the Heavenly Father; to insist on regarding him as good, and not evil; and to disregard the decisions of those priests, synods, councils, or associations that have spoken evil of him. Who are they, that out of deference to them we should admit God to be unjust, vindictive, cruel? Faith forbids us so to desecrate the idea of him. By faith we understand that he *loves* the creatures he has made. Will they tell us that they also insist upon the love of God? Well, then, let us explain that we believe that God *so* loves mankind as not to broil any of them alive to all eternity. Just as certainly as reason forbids belief in a being commanding babies to be roasted for his worship in this world, just so certainly does it forbid belief in one who will himself roast men and women in the next world.

The opening assumption of the teachers of orthodoxy — the indispensable prerequisite which you must accept before they can get any power over you — is the doctrine that you are "a *lost* sinner." Not for a moment is such a monstrous doctrine to be admitted! However ignorant, uncertain, doubtful, fearful, unworthy *you* may be, God, who made you and placed you here, has *not* lost you. He will certainly take care of you. A part of the care that he will take will be to prove to you by experience that, so far as you choose evil instead of good, — in this world or the next, — you will certainly be worse off for it; and so far as you choose good instead of evil, — in this world or the next, — you will certainly be better off for it. This is the key to his administration. You cannot escape it; you cannot be "lost" from it; and, having been created a reasonable being, you will assuredly, sooner or later, not only see the wisdom of co-operating with it instead of resisting it, but *act* upon what you see, and thus gain its permanent, everlasting advantages.

C. K. WHIPPLE.

TO G. L. S.

FEBRUARY, 1860.

BY all the purest love I bear my kind,
By all the hope I have of human weal,
By all of duty, resolute and leal,
That ever may my spirit bless and bind,
Am I to thee drawn closer and affined,
Thou mankind's lover, whom to name my friend
Were prodigal, as on myself to spend
A public wealth for myriads designed.
I near thy spirit as Missouri bears
His waters to his brother stream, not through
Fondness, as wooed of thee, or thee to woo;
But never is my heart on noble cares
Rightly intent, but whither it repairs
Thy soul with earnest tide is flowing too.

D. A. W.

THE PERSONALITY OF GOD.

WORDS are the habitations wherein dwell ideas: and as the inmates of a house may pass away and be utterly forgotten, while the house they lived in still remains standing; so the ideas that were included in words may utterly pass away, though the words yet remain. And as into empty houses, which their former owners have departed from, new ones enter in and take possession; so do we find it to be the case with words: when the former ideas which dwelt in the words denoting them have from any cause died out or been forgotten, new ideas are found to be prowling round the vacated premises, which they

soon seize and occupy for themselves; and proceeding on the legal maxim that "possession is nine points of the law," men are ever apt to regard the present owners, whether it be men of houses, or ideas of words, as the true and legitimate possessors of the same, and as having the sole right to ownership. It is a very common mistake to think that, by a certain particular *word*, the same identical train of thought is called up to all people and in all times: the truth is far otherwise. The train of ideas called up in the mind of Hodge the plowman, when he hears the word "cow" mentioned, differs *toto calo* from that which would be evoked in the mind of Agassiz the philosopher. "*Quicquid recipitur, recipitur ad modum recipientis*;" and in great measure it depends upon the previous information and degree of cultivation on the part of the *recipient* as to what he will really *receive*, — in other words, what ideas will be called up in his mind.

There is probably no case of this permanence of words and change of ideas so remarkable as is the history of the word "God," so manifold and various, not to say mutually contradictory, are the ideas that have found shelter under this one term. In fact, to write a history of the word "God" would be to write the whole history of man, a task to undertake which, it is almost needless to say, is quite hopeless here. I propose merely to consider what are the ideas contained in or expressed by the word "God," so far as I am able to grasp them, or in anywise comprehend them. It is, I think, very clear that an Englishman and a Chinaman — supposing the difficulty of their speaking different languages overcome — do not mean the same thing, are not conscious of the same ideas, though they both mention the name of God. To the one a totally different train of ideas is called up from that which the other perceives; they would have little or nothing in common to go upon. Of course, the Christian missionaries would get over the difficulty very easily by telling the Chinaman that all his ideas were nonsense, and that if he is to get at the truth, he must throw away his own and adopt theirs. But this is not argument to a scientific mind at least: it is mere assertion. Let us try to find some common measure that is contained in both, or rather in every form of religion, of what is meant by the word "God." Even those uncultivated nations

from whom we received originally the word "God," with its accompanying and varying *ideas*, could not fail to have noticed — the veriest savage that ever prowled about on the face of the earth, intent only on satisfying the cravings of his appetites, could not fail to notice — the necessary connection that exists between *cause* and *effect*; no matter how dimly and obscurely he saw it, he could not help seeing that every *effect*, no matter of what kind, required and presupposed an efficient and sufficient *cause*; again recognizing, as he could not fail to do, no doubt indistinctly and uncertainly, — the essential difference between *ego* and *non-ego*, *subject* and *object*, he was driven to the conclusion that, besides himself and his fellows, there must be some *cause* of the various *effects* he saw produced around him, the various phenomena of nature he saw daily and hourly going on everywhere. In this process may, I think, be found that underlying idea or train of ideas that pervades all conceptions of the word "God," and that, with all kinds of superadded ideas, has ever been the groundwork upon which men have built their various conceptions of God. But men in general have not been content with resting in the possession of this abstract and impersonal idea of God: they have ever dressed it up to suit themselves; and, for my part, I do not think it has been improved at their hands. It had been well if men had been content to rest with the original idea in its native grandeur, and perhaps we may add, its native indistinctness; but men have ever desired to know, or at any rate seem to know, more about this mysterious existence: they have added this quality and that quality, and all to an indefinite degree, in hopes of more clearly realizing and comprehending that which from its very nature is incapable of realization or comprehension at our hands; they have not been content to confess their own ignorance, but have striven to hide it in a perfect storm-cloud of ideas and attributes that have for the most part pretty effectually hidden from their gaze the very objects which they were intended to adorn and illustrate. The naked athlete is of himself a goodly object to look upon; but men prefer to see him dressed up in a suit of broadcloth, with any amount of shirt-front showing, and doing the amiable in society.

The rude and uncivilized man would find it difficult, if not

impossible, to conceive of a *cause* that was not a person, and hence arises that tendency so marked in primitive races of deifying the powers of nature, moral laws, and other efficient causes. The heaven above us, the firm and solid dome of sky that overhangs us, is bodily held up and sustained by Atlas; the consequences of sin are left to Nemesis to accomplish. And this process of personification, or giving to the abstract idea, *God*, a personal habitation or form, has led men to invest these personal gods of theirs with human attributes, human desires, affections, and weaknesses: Atlas is very tired of holding up heaven, and glad of a short rest from his weary job; Nemesis is like the mule, very slow, but is sure-footed, and never fails to catch her victim, let him try his best to run away. The ideas, then, that such peoples entertain of God are necessarily reflexes of themselves; if they are bloody-minded, unscrupulous and selfish, these qualities will surely appear in their God. He who chose a peculiar people to himself is, to a wonderful degree, the very image of the people he so chose: he has their national characteristics strongly marked, if not absurdly caricatured; if they are avaricious and grasping, it is he that orders them to be so, for it is pleasing to him that they should be so; if they are rebellious and headstrong, it is but natural that their God should be changeful, irritable and jealous, and so we always find it to be the case. If a people are, as a whole, intellectual, pleasure-loving, fond of the arts, yet with a dash of blood-thirstiness about them, we find their gods clearly portraying these national characteristics: we find Minerva the very embodiment of all learning; Venus, the giver of all pleasures and delights to her voluptuous votaries; Apollo inspires the artist as he breathes out his soul in the harmony of delicious strains; while the stern god Mars rejoices in the din of battle and savor of newly shed blood. So will it ever be; the great law of supply and demand, demand and supply, holds good in the case of gods as well as in the case of cotton goods or Springfield rifles. The possession of certain qualities incites men to conceive that all other men, and more especially their own gods, should possess them also, if possible more so. St. Paul, rejoicing in his new-found creed and comfort, would have all men even as he was; the fox in

Æsop, with his tail cut off, would have all the other foxes like him in this respect. This almost universally felt desire of blending the natures of God and man into one, of investing God with some, or rather with the highest—those that are held in highest esteem—of the attributes of man, has given rise to most of the conceptions of God that we can discover as having held sway over the minds of men; and as these are full of mutual contradictions and absurdities, and evidently cannot all be true, while most likely all are more or less false in their very nature, we are forced to question the justice of the method by which they were arrived at, and seriously to doubt whether it be possible at all to arrive at true conceptions on this matter by proceeding in this way. It would be far better to confess our ignorance as to the true nature of God, our inability to frame adequate conceptions of the nature of that Being who can only be known mediately through his laws, which are the only messengers that tell us of his existence and nature. *Qui nescit ignorare, ignorat scire*; and while, by abandoning many of our notions of God, all, in fact, that are built upon the assumption of his personality and those supposed qualities of his that are based on and depend upon the truth of this assumption, we shall, it is true, strip the idea of God of much that we have been accustomed to cling to fondly and have long regarded as an essential element in the conception; but, at the same time, we shall shake ourselves free of error, and it is certainly a step in advance to get rid of false conceptions; it is a necessary step in the advance of true knowledge to be no longer under the dominion of error. When we marry a wife it is necessary that she should be disengaged from all other matrimonial connections; and when we enter the service of truth it is necessary that we should be no longer wedded to error. I must admit that the popular idea of God is a fuller and warmer portrait of him than the one I would draw, but it has this fatal objection, that it is not a true portrait; and I must continue to prefer the dimmer and more indistinct one, because it is true so far as it goes, and it shows all that apparently can be shown. "*Magis quiescet animus, errabit minus, contentus eruditione parabili.*"

CHARLES HENRY.

NOTES.

MESSIANIC NOTIONS OUTGROWN.

COMPARISONS of our present departure from the old religious systems with that of any previous epoch fail, because the movement of to-day proceeds by a different method. The importance of individuals is no longer celebrated. We are no longer expecting the great man will come. He may indeed come; he may be here; he may be a saint, even a hero: but our concern takes another direction. What do *we* know? What can *we* do? For the idea of substitution of knowledge or virtue hardly enters into our conception. We confess the uses of men, the service they render. Thanks, once for all, to the wise man! we are interested in his thinking; we listen: then we, the people, will pass on and upward ourselves. We cannot pause to show an outward, formal, idle homage. The day is too precious, and we, too, have a work to do.

The present reformation is the endeavor of the human mind to emancipate itself from ignorance; of human character to harden and perfect itself in the virtues,—it is the effort of collective humanity which demands personal experience; the mind, heart, and soul of each member of the great family enlisted for the highest attainment; and not the sanctifying, apologizing influence of the few over the many. Each soul is its own Messiah.

The Spirit of the new era is not inquisitive to know who is first, or last; who most nearly conforms in his career to his approved thought: the thought is ever well; his short-coming is his private affair; so is his strict conformity. All these things are bits of personal gossip which may please the idle and vulgar; but as for the new Spirit and its purpose, they present no points of attraction: on the contrary, they are born of an alien spirit. No man may rise to say, "*I* said it first; *I* did it best." The Spirit of the reform passes on as though it would reply in so doing, "What are *you* to me?"

The Messianic notion is of the past. Let it repose in honor; but the new world will have no use for it. The Christs belong to a dead epoch. The Luthers are an extinct race. They do not flourish in modern society; we have no place for them; we have no soil in which to grow them.

The people need not personal narrative; not a movement with a great name, ancient or modern, nor an institution at its centre. "Give us truth, and not your trivial experience; give us ideas, and not the details of your accidental connection with them. All that is well enough for the privacy of friends, if you desire; but for the great work of human emancipation we cannot waste time to hear your story, nor do we like to spare you from the better service you are able to render. We conjure you to forget yourself!"

MR. FROTHINGHAM'S lecture at Horticultural Hall appears to have created unusual excitement. A general protest, in which the unorthodox even participate, showing a zeal hardly to be expected, is being made, few feeling any enthusiasm for rebuilding an "altar to the Unknown God." It is possible, however, that the lecturer's statement that "the unknown is not the non-existent" will satisfy the more reasonable of his critics that he had at least a profounder feeling as to the Divine Mystery than their eager opposition was disposed to concede. We confess in reading the extract given below to receiving an impression that here was somewhat wiser than the prevailing and more popular discourse about God had reached.

Who interprets the divine order, beauty, harmony, and truth which are expressed in creation? On one side of the veil which hides the meaning from our view is man, suffering, sorrowing, sinning, perishing. On the other is the key to all this, the answer to his prayer. By whose hand shall that veil be lifted? On which side hangs the cord, at the tension of which it shall roll up and disappear? On the divine side, says the old thought; the cord is in the hand of the Great Architect. On the human side, says the new thought; man's fingers control the string. The old faith implied that God was hidden both by reason of the inscrutableness of his nature and the depths of his design. The new faith starts with the assumption that God conceals nothing; it is his nature to discover himself; the universe is a vision of him; creation is his manifold symbol; the heavens declare the

glory of God, the firmament showeth his handiwork. Passing over the speculative merit of this difference, he proposed to challenge the revelation which is deemed necessary to the safety and the blessedness of mankind,—the conception of a God who discloses himself at pleasure, who selects his company, who chooses his hour, and breaks the silence in the thunder of the oracle, or in the whisper of the still small voice in the heart. This idea of revelation, and its justification, he charged with wasting time, squandering intellect, thwarting reason, and misleading conscience. Under the last charge, he said there was no more deadly enemy of mankind than the assumption of divine prerogatives by private souls. In its rudest form, and the rudest form is the commonest, we call it Fanaticism.

From Ravaillac, who had a call to murder Henry IV., to Biland, who had an inspiration to shoot the first minister whom he heard repeat the creed; from Bunyan, tormented by the persuasion that he had committed the unpardonable sin, to Brigham Young, who commits it every day and feels no torment whatever,—what a record of delusion it is! The revival preacher mistaking perspiration for inspiration, and his personal magnetism for the presence of God; the Mormon elder believing he has a revelation that Mormonism shall suffer no shock; the assassins of India calling themselves the ministers of God; the dogmatist promulgating his definition in the name of God; the sectarian strengthening his denominational stockade; the preacher propounding his riddle; the critic brandishing his grammar and lexicon; the reformer tyrannizing over his neighbor; the philanthropist denouncing good sense,—were instanced as manifestations of this form of fanaticism. The man who thinks he has a revelation may judge by that token that he has none. The one infallible sign by which you may know that God is speaking to you is your deafness to your own voice. When the attendants cry out, the oracle must be dumb. Passing from the fanaticism of the individual, the lecturer spoke of the fanaticism of the mass. The conversion of Constantine was the signal for new wars. To define the revelation the bishops wrangled at Nicæa and cursed at Ephesus. To decide the definition Arians and Athanasians kept the world in turmoil. In the name of the revealed God ruffians were crowned with stars and seekers with thorns. For the same reason Walter the penniless went on his fool's errand towards the Holy Land; Christendom poured into Palestine to baptize the misbelievers in blood. The revealed God split in twain the Eastern and Western Empire; depopulated the south of France; blighted Spain; convulsed Germany; made the Low Countries a horror. His anointed servants brought science to its knees in the person of Galileo; struck at philosophy in the person of Giordano Bruno; suppressed humanity in Arnold of Brescia; and burned the soul of the Beatitudes in Savonarola.

Of course it was foolish to quarrel with history. But we can draw lessons from it. To speak of the necessity of revelation was logical once; the necessity of abandoning the thought of a revelation is logical now. Whether the organ of revelation be a church, a creed, a bible, or a soul, we must give up

the notion that the divine oracle is there. We may ask questions and answer them. But let us neither ask nor answer them in the name of God. Let him at least be speechless.

The Athenians had an altar dedicated to the Unknown God. It was built to the silent, formless mystery from which they expected no answer, and looked for no vision. To all others they repaired with gifts and sweet, flattering words. To this they brought their wonder, their awe, their faith, and their adoration. The rest were policy-shops; this was a haunt of prayer. Near the rest stood the idol; over this brooded the Soul of the soul. Christendom retains its Unknown God, the Eternal Father, the fathomless abyss of being. It is no atheist who builds altars to him. The Unknown is not the non-existent; he is the Possible, the Ideal, the Perfect.

The speaker, in conclusion, dwelt upon the consolations of the old and of the new faith, and said it was a mistake to suppose that God vanishes when he withdraws from our range of vision. Then he assumes his true place. Then he verily appears. We meet him as Adam did, among the shadows at the close of the day; as the patriarch did when the evening dews were falling, and the dusk was gathering. We meet him in the twilight, the weird, mysterious hour which belongs neither to day nor night; midway between the darkness that is to fold in our unconsciousness and the light that has been guiding our steps; the hour of serenity and meditation, when we see little, but feel much; when little is discerned, but much is suggested; when earthly objects are becoming dimmer, and immensity is becoming each instant thicker sown with stars.

A LATE number of "Fraser's Magazine" contains the following poem, which may fitly follow the report of Mr. Frothingham's discourse:—

PROTEUS.

A sense sublime

Of something far more deeply interposed,
Whose dwelling is the light of setting sun,
And the round ocean, and the living air,
And the green earth, and in the mind of man.

I.

SOLE in blank, boundless darkness, dimly bright,
The horned moon hangs o'er the viewless sea,
Whose spell-bound wavering lips wash fitfully
Up the black shingle in waverings of crisp light.
Lonely I stand—the midnights' eremite,
Whilst mine awed, seaward gaze goes wistfully
Into the darkness face to face with me,
The darkness where the sea is, and the night.

And lo! I feel it coming again, again —
 Up from the waves as Proteus did of old.
 Ah, wert Thou like that old God of the main
 To whom we cry "Unveil" forever in vain,
 Formless Desire, which no eye may behold,
 No hands of ours can weary, and no spell chain!

II.

Ah, bosom-friend! familiar Mystery!
 Oh Lurer with veiled face! Oh Comforter!
 One Spirit of many forms felt everywhere,
 Who knows what manner of Spirit Thou mayst be?
 None, though his most loved haunts be full of Thee.
 Valleys, whose leaves and clear streams sleep and stir,
 The blue flash of the diving kingfisher,
 The rose whose depths of scent soft rains set free,
 Though Thy wild way be with the hurricane,
 Thunder and cloud; though he behold the day
 Cradling Thee in some wandering eastern fleece
 Of loveliest fire; or sadly sighing, again,
 His evening soul bewail Thee, dying away
 To unknown lands, and gold Hesperian seas.

III.

Ah! even now Thou art very near to me;
 But veiled and far as ever from my prayer.
 Still my soul finds Thee, and strange longings there
 Start at Thy voice, and cry in choirs towards Thee.
 In mine own soul what may these tumults be —
 Desires I cannot rule, that do not dare
 Whole days to stir within their secret lair,
 But at Thy voice seek their wild Rhodope?
 One to another in a strange tongue calls —
 I hearken, but can catch not what they say;
 Only I hear their voices far away
 Swell, and a passionate clamor at intervals.
 Ah, who art Thou their God? for what boon pray
 These mine own inmost soul's vague Bacchanals?

IV.

What! wilt Thou never be revealed to us?
 Must our souls still in blindness follow Thee?
 Nor, borne in swift raft over the deep sea,
 Ever sleep even upon thy Dindymus?

The Radical.

Not ever build Thee up a pillared house,
 Nor serve Thee with articulate liturgy?
 Never before Thine altar bend our knee,
 Nor weave rare flowers in coronals round Thy brows,
 No costlier offerings than these prefer,
 Blind discontent, insatiable unrest,
 Deep, lonely love following an unknown guest,
 Sad as man's love for woman, and tenderer?
 Lo these be all we offer, alas! our best,
 No certain gold and frankincense and myrrh.

V.

Do we then waver, and fear we are fools and blind?
 Doubt we? and ask Thee whither lead Thy ways!
Ask whither? Nay, *see* whence, pale, doubtful face!
 Look back, and see how far we have left behind
 Anger and blinding lusts, and loves that bind,
 And the mean voice that to any moment says,
 "Stay, thou art fair," as with unflinching pace,
 Veiled One, we follow Thee, and trust to find
 Hereafter Thee unveiled — knowing, and known —
 Set with a rainbow round about Thy throne,
 Soul of our life's unrest — to find Thee
 The thing we have long sought sorrowing here from far,
 The Spirit of the bright and morning star,
 The sunrise, and the sunset, and the sea!

As evidencing the truth of our statement last month in regard to the tendency of Liberal Orthodoxy, we will once more refer to a discourse of Mr. Murray's, recently given in Music Hall. His theme was the bearing of burdens. He said each soul must bear its own burden; the help which others can render is comparatively little. Leaving aside a considerable amount of exaggeration of the importance of the sense of sin,—which he seemed to believe should be very accute in order to be efficacious to the soul,—there remains this practical point, to the effect that none could possess the advantages of virtue but by possessing it as the fibre of their own character. Still retaining for his use the old phraseology,—which makes God a very excellent though stern sort of supreme functionary, who, some time or other, will take his

children directly in hand to bestow upon them sugar plums or a whip, — he said God would deal with souls singly, each by itself; and no one soul could bear the sin of another. As a maple and an ash might grow side by side, their roots meet and draw their life from the same sources, yet the two bear their own leaves, and have each its own self-identification of character in all respects, so must it be with souls, — they must pass for what they are in and of themselves, and so find heaven or hell. He intimated the inability of God, under his present system, to screen or save beyond the capacity of the individual soul to receive the riches of his love.

He exhorted his hearers to self-reliance, and admonished them to be ever mindful of the unspeakable value of their own heroism and virtue as passports to the heavenly state. Then followed, strangely enough, the old exhortation about looking to Christ for help.

The somerset from the body of the discourse to this last clause was complete and most apparent. But our orthodox friends are tolerably satisfied in these days if so the somerset be really made, and the preacher is at last found "standing up for Jesus." "First the blade, then the ear," etc.

It surprises some who are lookers on at the "Radical Club," to see with what zeal a few defend their right to the name of Christian. "Those of us who *prefer* to be known as Christian," says one. As though white sheep would be esteemed as black, if, forsooth, they did but take it into their heads to "prefer" that distinction.

THE orthodox side of Boston has waked up to the need of a course of lectures to offset those instituted by the unorthodox in Horticultural Hall, and elsewhere. The course bids fair to be an able one. Referring to it, the "Watchman and Reflector" takes occasion to speak as follows of what it calls

"MODERN SKEPTICISM."

The arrangement for a series of free lectures in our city by first-class minds is a timely one. The old infidelities of the past were met in their day

and vanquished. The Christian church, however, has kept faithfully and vigilantly on guard at the old points of attack, with arms adapted to the old methods of offense. But the spirit of infidelity has not been killed out, any more than the spirit of rebellion is ever killed out by the overthrow of its armies in the field. That spirit will live as long as sin lives, and will organize for aggression again in every period of spiritual declension or general worldliness. It was never more aggressive than at the present day.

The tactics, however, of infidelity are all changed. Its weapons are new weapons. The points of attack are not only different, but more vital. It seeks also to connect itself with the best tendencies of the times, with free thought, with the critical spirit, and especially with science. It assumes to be a part of the progress of the age. Formerly, it was vulgar and rash and weak in strategy, and depended for success less on a show of reason, and more on that fully developed depravity of heart and life which wished the Bible false and therefore believed it to be. Now it is scholarly. It is associated with intellectual pride, rather than with carnal lust. It does not set aside Christianity, but gives it a high place among the religions of the ages. It professes to explain religion, like everything else, on natural principles. Science is its stronghold. Nor is this a stronghold to be despised. The progress of science is the proudest fact of the present century. Its triumphs in every direction are marvelous. The spectro-scope, as supplementing the telescope and the microscope, is now making discoveries that awe us with their sublimity, as well as startle us with their certainty and clearness. We are beginning, at length, to comprehend man's predestined high mastership of nature. But elevation brings peril. We reach high and then wish to get higher. It was an archangel that aspired to God's throne. So man, realizing through science his earthly sovereignty, would throw off his dependence on the Central Throne. Hence, nearly all the more important attacks on Christianity now come from science. Of course our old weapons of defense are useless. The foe comes against us with cannon instead of arrows, — indeed, with mortars, and monitors, and needle-guns; and we must meet him accordingly. True Christianity is its own evidence, and vital personal godliness is the best weapon both of defense and of offense, and that preacher does the most to stay the progress of infidelity who does the most to extend living, active, intelligent piety around him. Still the ministry need to prepare themselves specially for the conflicts of the present period. In this they will be but imitating Paul and James and John. The old sermons on Christian evidences will not answer now. Nor is it our great cities alone that are exposed. The middle-men between scientists and the community are at work everywhere, making a speciality of the literary and secular press and of the lecture system, and even availing themselves of Christian pulpits. They have stolen a march on us. They have secured most important vantage-ground. Nothing but persistent and wisely directed effort by our religious guides can now save from infidelity those who are to lead the thought of the next generation.

"WHAT do you think of the Horticultural-Hall Lectures?" asks one old-fashioned Christian of another.

"Why, they show how much can be said on any side of most any subject. Beyond that I don't think they will do any good or any harm," was the reply.

"I am surprised to find, though, that these men have a good many ideas I can agree to."

"Why, of course; but they have *stolen* all that part from Christianity."

"But our minister, who is a Christian, don't preach the same."

"No; but—I hope you are not going there any more. I am not."

"THE INDEPENDENT" discourses to its "half million readers" as follows:—

Indeed, not only the world, but the church, is fast coming to the sensible conviction that it is not so much a man's belief as a man's conduct that makes him a Christian. If a man be of a devout, humble, and Christlike spirit, then—no matter what is his theological system, and no matter even if he have no theological system at all—that man is a Christian. To say that because a man does *not* believe in the divinity of Christ he is therefore *not* a Christian is as absurd as to say that because he *does* believe in the divinity of Christ he therefore *is* a Christian. Nine-tenths of all "the lewd fellows of the baser sort"—the rowdies and ragamuffins, who use the sacred name of the Lord Jesus to point their profane oaths—have never entertained a skeptical doubt as to Christ's divinity. Nine-tenths of the inmates of our state prisons and county jails are thoroughly orthodox and evangelical in their *belief*. It is generally an old-school Presbyterian, or Roman Catholic, or some other extremely Evangelical clergyman who is chosen by the sentenced murderer to accompany him to the scaffold. But are these criminals, on this evangelical account, to be called Christians? A man's intellectual belief, even on so solemn a subject as the divinity or non-divinity of Jesus Christ, has very little to do with making him a Christian. A so-called believer may be sound on all points of "the faith once delivered to the saints" (if anybody can tell exactly what that faith was); and yet he may not in his behavior and disposition bear the slightest resemblance to a Christian. On the other hand, a man may be what the Catechism, and the Confession, and the Thirty-nine Articles would unanimously adjudge a heretic; and yet by a pure and godly life he may be the most eminent Christian in the community in which he lives.

MR. POWELL, editor of the "Anti-slavery Standard," recently read a very interesting paper on the Quakers, at a special meet-

ing of members of the "Radical Club," at Mrs. Sargent's. We hear it warmly eulogized, and hope it may be more extensively published. The Quaker spirit — so to speak — in human nature gets so little chance to manifest itself in these vigorous, noisy days, one may welcome every presentation of its good side as a positive gain.

A discussion, of course, followed the reading of the essay, and many whose names are familiar to our readers participated. We find this brief report given in some of the papers.

Mr. John Weiss remarked that he had gladly heard the clear and candid statement of Mr. Powell. The radical error of the Quakers was that, believing in the "Inner Light," they undertook to organize it into a system. He had been acquainted with the best form of Quakerism in New Bedford, and felt competent to judge it. You find among those people a plain, equable, quiet manner of sustaining the burdens and losses of life. They know nothing of those Calvinistic despairs, floods of tears, outbursts of grief, which are found in that sect. You feel the spirit and presence of God among them. If you hear Quakers in their meeting-houses, you find that, even if not hireling preachers, they are not inspired ones. They have fallen back into a way of preaching the blood of Christ. A great moral sincerity is pre-eminently the charm of Quakerism. They are people who tell you your faults to your face. Socrates was a born Quaker. He had a restraining voice within him. Theodore Parker had the same, but he had more than a restraining voice, — an intuitive consciousness of right as well as wrong.

Mr. Wendell Phillips said he had no such intimate knowledge of Quakerism as Mr. Weiss had had. He might have had something to say in regard to the limitations and errors of Quakers, only Mr. Powell had candidly covered both sides of the question. To him the Quakers, like all sectarians, showed the imperfections of human nature. George Fox was a man of decided religious genius. William Penn was a different sort of a man, who would have been a doughface if he had lived in New England. The decline of Quakerism had begun earlier than Mr. Powell had said. Josiah Foster was a Pope among that people. Eliza Frye was a narrow-minded bigot, who would not stay in the house with Lucretia Mott because she did not believe in the Trinity. George Fox was the moving power of the system; when he ceased to move Quakerism fell back. There was something to be said of the treatment of the Quakers by our forefathers. Mary Dyer was a glorious apostle of truth; but the Quakers afterward really became a nuisance by their eccentricities, and needed a restraining force. This was mentioned as a palliation for the conduct of the Puritans, though it was not an excuse.

Mr. Samuel Longfellow had hoped to hear some good silence follow the essay, in imitation of the Quakers. He thought the Quaker self-control and tranquillity admirable things in the old, but more spontaneity was desirable

among the young people than they cultivated. The doctrine of immediate inspiration was a very precious one, and great was the faith of the Quakers in the power of bearing testimony against wrong, simply saying how it looked to their consciences, and persisting in it.

Dr. Bartol remarked that this doctrine existed long before the Quakers, as Mr. Weiss had said.

Mrs. Ednah D. Cheney said that Quakerism had an important place in religious history. Yet it was said that its ignoring art and science and the daily human necessity for these was an evil. There was a tendency to morbidness among the Quakers, and this had been noticed even among those who have come out from them.

Mr. F. B. Sanborn thought there was not a great deal of Quakerism in the world, or Mr. Phillips or Mr. Longfellow would have known more about it. English Quakerism sprang up among the English people at a time of great intellectual activity; but there was a very positive difference between the early Quakers and the Quakers of to-day, though both alike held to immediate inspiration.

Mr. Richard P. Hallowell thought Quakerism was a re-affirmation of what Jesus said.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY finds it difficult to please everybody; and why does it try? Has it forgotten the fable of the old man and his ass? Professing to be unsectarian, it yet has the Christian Scriptures read, and Christian prayers offered every morning. Considering its claim, this is not well. College prayers are foolish expenditures of time and breath in any case. At Harvard sleepy students fly to the chapel in overcoats and boots. The query is, What is the exact amount of benefit they thus derive? They bear witness of themselves that they are thereby got up in season for their breakfasts. The farce is well understood by bright undergraduates. Chapel exercises are a bore. A student needs to be stupidly pious to enjoy them. Cornell will act wisely in discontinuing them. It might as well do so, and secure the "game as well as the name." Read the following from "The New-York Examiner:"—

Its friends affirm that it is not irreligious, and in proof refer to the fact that on all great occasions the public exercises have been opened with prayer; that a university chapel is provided, and that the exercises of each working day in college have been opened with reading the Scriptures and prayer; that there exists among the students a "Young Men's Christian Association," and that large sums have been donated to the institution by

earnest Christians, men and women. On the other hand, it is answered that the institution has no recognized religious position; that its fundamental laws place open unbelievers, infidels, and even atheists, on a level with professed Christians as to eligibility to its professorships; its president, a true gentleman and scholar, is not a church-member, nor indeed a professed believer in Christianity, except in a very "liberal" or liberalistic way; that the religious atmosphere of the institution, so far as it has any, is decidedly Broad Churchish; and that, while a Christian terminology is used, distinctive Christian ideas are ignored or covertly discarded and placed at disadvantage; and that the men called there to shed the lustre of their own renown upon the institution have usually been of the class who call themselves "*Liberal* Christians," but who are recognized by the ridiculed "*Orthodox*" as polished skeptics.

On the other hand, we are glad to present the opinion of "The Independent:" —

Cornell University has no right to be, in any just sense, "a religious institution." It has no right to teach any scheme of theology. It has no right to incline itself one whit more to Christianity than to Judaism. It has no right to be a particle more Protestant than Catholic. It has no right to lend its influence either for or against the religious views of any one of its students. It has no right to impart to its administration any greater theological impulse than Mr. Boutwell gives to the United States Treasury, or Prof. Henry to the Smithsonian Institute.

And we have no hesitation in saying that, if the daily exercises at Cornell University are opened with reading the Bible, these readings ought to come under sentence of the same wise and just banishment which must sooner or later be passed on all similar exercises in our public schools. Cornell University is a public school. The Presbyterian, the Jew, the Romanist, the Confucian, all have an equal right to attend every public school in the Empire State; and they all have a similar right to attend the public university at Ithaca. Precisely the same argument can justly be made for opening the exercises, both of these schools and of this university, with the Koran, with the Confucian maxims, or with the Douay version, as with King James's Scriptures. It is high time that a more sensible notion of religious toleration should be practised by the officers of our public institutions. To begin the day, either in school or in college, by administering a public shock to the religious faith of a portion of the teachers or scholars is an outrage that ought to be honestly rebuked by those most thorough Protestants in whose behalf this "zeal without knowledge" is allowed to exhibit itself. Neither the common schools of New York nor the great university at Ithaca have any more right to impose the Christian Scriptures on Jewish students than the British parliament has to impose the English Church on the Irish people. Our forefathers, with a discernment which marked their statesmanlike forecast, ordained the perpetual separation of church and

state. The state, as such, cannot have a religion without overthrowing the present Federal Constitution. The state's various public institutions (its schools and colleges among them) cannot, without contravening the same Constitution, have a religion which that Constitution denies to the state itself.

MR. BEECHER refers to A. D. Mayo's extravagant article on "Atheistical Educational Conscience," after this manner:—

If zeal were argument, and assertion were principle, he would have made out a strong case. It is not enough, however, "to cry and shout," however Scriptural that may be under certain circumstances. Just now, honest and inquiring men desire a clear and calm statement of the true functions of civil government. Is the civil government in America a religious institution or not? Has it any religious functions? if so, what are they?

This will do so far as Mr. Mayo is concerned. It is just the point he fails to clear up. Yes or no: has the civil government religious functions? If yes, then "What are they?" we repeat the question. At the same time we will suggest a correction of Mr. Beecher's terminology. Has a civil government *ecclesiastical* functions? appears to be the real question. In our opinion a government has no functions which are *not* religious. Religion is so practical a thing, it cannot be divorced from the state. The true state demeans itself religiously. But establishing ecclesiastical machinery is another and wholly different matter.

UNDER the caption of "Society News," "The Home Journal" offers weekly an amusing array of notices of fashionable entertainments,—parlor theatricals, in which the actors are all real, every-day, home-made characters. We quote as follows, suppressing names:—

MRS. ———'s RECEPTION. — Mrs. ———, of Madison Avenue, gave an elegant reception on the evening of January —th. The cards read, "At home from eight until eleven o'clock." Sensible hours! The house was finely decorated with natural flowers, the mantelpieces being particularly resplendent. The parlor walls were covered with blue satin damask, the effect being elegant in the extreme. Mrs. ——— was attired in pearl-gray silk, high in the neck; worn with long sleeves, and a white point-lace shawl. Among the fashionable throng were General ——— and wife, General

— and wife, and Miss —. Senator —, a very polished and scholarly gentleman, was present, with his wife and step-daughter, Miss —, who was recognized at the Saratoga balls, last season, as one of the most beautiful and intelligent young ladies at the Springs. She was dressed in blue silk, trimmed with white. Townsend —, of Japan distinction, was of the company; so were the Fifth-Avenue —, elegantly habited; Mr. and Mrs. —, and Mr. —, and Mrs. —, whose dress was green silk, trimmed with most exquisite lace, and slashed with white satin. Mrs. —'s lovely daughter, recently married, was dressed in deep red silk, with jet ornaments, a very striking costume. There were, besides, several naval officers of the United States Army, and ladies of distinction too numerous to name. The toilette of Mrs. — was particularly noticed and admired. It consisted of a lovely white dress, a perfect cloud of white gauze; blond and ruches over white silk. Ornaments of diamonds; "*bouquet de corsage*," of natural carnations and geraniums.

And this is "society" in republican America! Editresses of "The Revolution," keep steadily at your work.

GEORGE W. CURTIS says of Theodore Parker,—

Not every one who knew his power knew into what sweetness and tenderness it could be softened, nor suspected that in the gladiator there was the loving and simple heart of the boy.

MR. RIPLEY'S letters from Rome to the "New York Tribune" are extremely interesting. From one of them we quote a short paragraph:—

According to Dr. Manning, the Pope, by God-given right, is not only the sovereign of Rome, but the autocrat of the world. It needs but another step to identify the Pontiff with the Supreme Being, which, if outward signs have any meaning, as a matter of fact, is already virtually accomplished in the imagination of the Roman populace. It was only to-day that, while driving through one of the narrow streets of the city, I was overtaken by the stately equipage of His Holiness. The passers-by on either side were at once hushed to silence. No one moved from the spot where he stood. Every head was uncovered, and every man and woman knelt down in the mud. The drivers of carriages left their seats, and joined the prostrate crowd. Moses at the burning bush could have given no stronger proofs of awe and adoration. The Pope benignly waved his paternal hand to bless the multitude, and even imparted a share of the benediction to the strangers and Gentiles who were in the shadow of his presence.

MR. RIPLEY would seem to have but little reverence for the doctrine of inspiration. Speaking of a vehement and hot debate by the bishops, he says, —

Neither side appeared to be under the influence of the Holy Dove, though its favor is claimed by both.

HEAR what "Warrington" says :—

You must know that at this club [Radical] Jesus (as the son of God in any peculiar sense) is — I mean to speak respectfully — on the defensive. Nobody defends the church; and long ago, as the London wits said when the case was decided in favor of the essayists and reviews, "Hell has been dismissed with costs," in all the polite ecclesiastical courts of this neighborhood. And as to the Scriptures, nobody within the same circle pretends to believe in their verbal inspiration. Rev. Dr. Bellows and Rev. Dr. Clarke are holding œcumenical council in Mr. Hale's new monthly: and they are showing, the first, that the less you believe in the verbal inspiration of the Bible, the more of a believer you are; and the second, that miracles are to be believed, but they are not miraculous, and that supernaturalism is the most natural thing in the world.

THE REV. CHARLES TURNER has a sonnet on "How the 'Higher Criticism' blesses the Bible," which contains a rebuke not altogether unmerited of those who, while they profess to have gotten clear over the spirit of Bibliolatry, still honey their criticism with, "And yet, it is the best of books." We reproduce it below :—

You say 'tis still God's Book, still true and wise, —
 Though you have shorn it of its noblest parts,
 Disparaged all its great biographies,
 And left no nourishment for pining hearts;
 But that's a foolish river, where the fish
 Are stolen from the waters, every fin,
 Whence thieves have harried all that God put in,
 And spared not scarce enough to freight a dish.
 So have you stolen away our food for faith —
 With Moses disallowed, and Paul reviewed,
 And Christ Himself by rival pens pursued,
 That race each other through his life and death —
 It irks my soul to see how bland you look,
 Giving your foolish blessing to the Book!

WE have to regret the discontinuance of "Every Saturday." A journal bearing the same name is yet published by Messrs. Fields & Osgood, but the old favorite has disappeared. Its successor, though well illuminated, lacks all the brilliancy of the original. Pity that everything must go by the board in this fashion for want of adequate support.

NOTES FROM THE PEOPLE.

Seldom in my whole life have I read a paper which I like so well as Mr. Potter's paper on "Christianity and its Definitions." It is able, candid, beautiful. I wish every family of culture had a copy of it. GERRIT SMITH.

The "Index" thinks that to reign by serving is less noble than to serve without reigning.

The question in my mind is, "Whether one can serve except as he reigns?"

It seems to me that only in so far as one loves and inspires love in return can he be helpful. Those who hate "The Radical" or the "Index" fail to see any truth in either: it is love that gives clear vision. But he who is loved reigns — not by compulsion, but by attraction. It is *right* he should, for it is inevitable; it is as right as the law of gravitation, and like gravitation draws all to a common centre.

I think the superiority of Jesus to Socrates lay in his power of love. He made truth *personal*. There is no other truth. Abstract truths (so called) seem to me a contradiction of terms. All truth is alive. To be alive it must be a portion of some soul with power to influence other souls. D. H. M.

Let me take this occasion to say how much I like your first editorial note in February number, "Passing each other." I have not for a long time seen anything so well put in a little compass. W. J. P.

"The Radical" contains much I cannot appropriate because so new, but I regard it as one of the valuable helps towards a gradual unfolding. To me it is also a key to much of the transitional phenomena observable in the social, political, and religious, or scientific world. MARY D. T.

I regret to see how little is cared about theological error by many persons, — most, indeed, of my acquaintance, — after they have fought their way through it. Our well-to-do church people will give from twenty-five to fifty dollars a year "to support the gospel," and the preachers will murder logic and common sense and truth week after week, and our well-to-do liberals would think they were almost ruined if they gave five dollars a year for the support of liberal views. I can't help it! I suppose I could by making an earnest plea get up a club for "The Radical;" but this is distasteful to me. Don't want to use an influence, if I could, that involves the pockets!

J. S. P.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

CHIPS FROM A GERMAN WORKSHOP. By Max Müller. M. A., Fellow of All Soul's College, Oxford. 2 vols. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1869.

It might be easy to point out not a few forces which have been busy, in the last fifty years, leading men's minds to the study of natural religion, and of human character in its broadest phases. Very few are aware, however, how great has been the influence in this direction of the sacred books of the people who dwell on the opposite side of the globe. Certain general forces—liberty and democracy—have unsettled many minds, especially in this country, weakening their hold on their various religious faiths; but the few who have met the Bibles of other great nations have been not only saved thereby from “squalid skepticism,” but have had their thoughts awakened to an unprecedented interest in the subject of religion.

These books, besides opening a new world to Christians, were found to afford religious inspiration and moral precept of as high order as aught in Old or New Testament. Brahmins had their sacred songs and Buddhists their moral law. The Psalms were duplicated in the Vedas, and the Beatitudes in the Tripitaka and the Bhagavat-Geeta. The saying of St. Augustine, that “there is no false religion which does not contain some elements of truth,” was mildly drawn. Such refined morals, such stoicism, such anti-worldliness,—not other-worldliness such as the Christian church preaches,—such religious zeal distinguished these newly discovered religions as the Christian had not dreamed of as existing outside of his little world. Besides, the followers of these faiths were so numerous—a single class, the Buddhists, outnumbering the Christians themselves—that all who learned these things, and obeyed the intellect, were henceforth eager to find out all that might be known in relation to them. With the exception of the Bhagavat-Geeta and the sayings of Confucius and a fragment of the Veda, little could be obtained; but this little was a lure to every high-minded philologist which would not let him rest.

“Chips from a German Workshop” is a report of progress in the great investigation thus set agoing. It consists of lectures and essays given and published from time to time between the years 1853 and 1868, and ranges over nearly the whole region to be examined. It discusses the Vedas, or sacred books of the Brahmins, the works of Confucius, Buddhism, Christianity, the religious pictography of Central America, and kindred themes.

Christianity is remanded among the profane religions; or, better, all religions, Christianity included, are recognized as phases of natural religion. Buddhism, Christianity, Islamism, in their highest meanings, are only other

words for religion. As titles of sects, they are the names of those combinations of pure religion and ignorance which different climates and ages have naturally produced.

This conclusion Mr. Müller does not indeed state in so many words as a result of his studies. He seems rather to prefer to give the world the facts, — the foot-prints discovered in his historical research, — and let priests and philosophers draw their own conclusions. But here and there sentences escape the author, which, if taken in their whole significance, are on the side of the doctrine that religion is natural in all its forms. Take the following for instance : —

The real history of man is the history of religion — the wonderful ways by which the different families of the human race advanced towards a truer knowledge and a deeper love of God.

The idea of revelation is not a modern idea, nor is it an idea peculiar to Christianity. The literature of India is saturated with this idea from beginning to end.

Throughout the whole work there is not one word of proof of the theory of revelation ; but, on the contrary, there are mountains of evidence on the other side.

Language is a key in Müller's hands with which, like the Arabian knight, he unlocks door after door in the regions of mystery and magic. And, once opened, magician, prophet, hermit, saint, are straightway delegated to a place in natural history. Their existence, their sentiments, their very inspirations are attributable to natural forces. Philology bridges gulf after gulf, links India, Greece and Germany into one people, and traces every river, lake, ocean of wisdom to a single fountain, — man. If Jehovah talked with Moses on the mountain, philology has no testimony in favor of the fact, but no end of argument against it.

But what matter ? It is no new discovery that the argument for revelation is the coarsest sieve through which fact and history were ever poured. Nothing stands in the way of recognition and emphasis of the fact that religion is a natural production of the earth, but a little social prejudice and a little commercial fear, and a good deal of priestly woodenness.

To most people, as to Müller himself, the chief interest of these books lies in the merely scientific phases of them. Our age has a wonderful hunger for bare facts. The barer the better. If the geologist keeps to shale and sandstone, the philologist to roots and accents, and Agassiz to scales, people listen, and exclaim, "How wondrous wise !" But let the linguist grow any religious foliage from his roots, and Agassiz remove the scales from his theologic eyes, and the people drop them like hot iron.

Müller keeps a very passable attitude towards religion. He does not say, as a lady did last winter after listening to Samuel Johnson's lecture on the Indian religions, "How small Christianity seems beside Buddhism !" but he says often, and with emphasis, "How great is Buddhism !"

The charming chapter of all, in these volumes, is that on "Buddhist Pil-

grims." Sangreal was never sought with holier zeal than relics and works of Buddhism were hunted for by Hiouen-thsang in the heart of India,—the Palestine of this religion.

In the chapter on "Buddhism," there is a sketch of the early life of Buddha that is full of high suggestion.

The child grew up a most beautiful and most accomplished boy, who soon knew more than his masters could teach him. He refused to take part in the games of his playmates, and never felt so happy as when he could sit alone, lost in meditation, in the deep shadows of the forest. It was there that his father found him when he thought him lost; and, in order to prevent the young prince from becoming a dreamer, the king determined to marry him at once. His marriage proved one of the happiest, but the prince remained, as he had been before, absorbed in meditation on the problem of life and death. "Nothing is stable on earth," he used to say, "nothing is real. Life is like the spark produced by the friction of wood. It is lighted and is extinguished; and we know not whence it came or whither it goes. There must be some supreme intelligence where we could find rest. If I attained it, I could bring light to man; if I were free myself, I could deliver the world."

One day, when the prince with a large retinue was driving through the eastern gate of the city on the way to one of his parks, he met on the road an old man, broken and decrepit. One could see the veins and muscles over the whole of his body; his teeth chattered, he was covered with wrinkles, bald, and hardly able to utter hollow and unmelodious sounds. He was bent on his stick and all his limbs and joints trembled. "Who is that man?" said the prince to his coachman. "He is small and weak, his flesh and his blood are dried up, his muscles stick to his skin, his head is white, his teeth chatter, his body is wasted away; leaning on his stick, he is hardly able to walk, stumbling at every step. Is there something peculiar in his family, or is this the common lot of all created beings?"

"Sir," replied the coachman, "that man is sinking under old age; his senses have become obtuse, suffering has destroyed his strength, and he is despised by his relations. He is without support, and useless, and people have abandoned him like a dead tree in the forest. But this is not peculiar to his family. In every creature youth is defeated by old age. Your father, your mother, all your relations, all your friends will come to the same state; this is the appointed end of all creatures."

"Alas!" replied the prince, "are creatures so ignorant, so weak and foolish, as to be proud of the youth by which they are intoxicated, not seeing the old age which awaits them? As for me, I go away. Coachman, turn my chariot quickly. What have I, the future prey of old age, what have I to do with pleasure?" And the young prince returned to the city without going to his park.

Three subsequent pleasure-rides of the prince end in a similar way. Each time he goes home to meditate on the great problem suggested by sickness and poverty and death. At length he leaves his home and becomes a hermit and a student. "After long meditations and ecstatic visions, he at last imagined that he had arrived at that true knowledge which discloses the cause, and thereby destroys the fear of all the changes inherent in life."

Whatever Buddha's knowledge amounted to, he became the founder of a religion which is still professed by forty-five million of human beings.

It is to be observed that a number of the works which Mr. Müller reviews

in these volumes are French. One of the best papers is a discussion of M. Renan's doctrine of Semitic Monotheism, and illustrates the fact, that, while France is unequalled in scientific research and discovery, Germany is still the master in right generalization.

We greet these volumes with somewhat of the same pleasure with which Columbus welcomed the birds and the sweet odors that floated out to his ship from the new lands he was approaching. These are signals of a hitherto unknown region of literature, and precursors of a time when all nations shall have one religion, — the religion of nature, — and shall hold it intelligently.

J. B. M.

ECCE CÆLUM; or Parish Astronomy. By a Connecticut pastor. 7th edition. Boston: Nichols and Noyes. 1870.

The author of this little work has knowledge; zeal, too, he has in abundance, but, like some lines of travel, the two fail to connect.

Skipping the ludicrous efforts at fine writing, and the still more ludicrous attempts to make science and orthodoxy agree, this is a very fair *resume* of what is now known concerning the heavens.

Perhaps, on the whole, it is a good idea to get the scale of the universe on the foot-rule of Connecticut Calvinism. It does the universe no harm, and it does keep the reader amused — or should we say "edified"?

In an age when everything is being explained at a rate that threatens to soon leave us without a single mystery to wonder at, it is refreshing to know, on the authority of Rev. Dr. Burr (for such, we learn, is the author's name), that "terrestrial nature is one huge sphinx." He might have said with Mr. Mantalini, "one 'demnition' huge sphinx," which would have been still more forcible; but as this smacks of profane literature, he prefers to add that "She" (Nature) "vomits enigmas on us in seas." What have infidels like Huxley and Darwin to say to that? Certainly, if they are not too completely overwhelmed, they must think that Nature is in a very bad way indeed, — too sick to exist much longer.

But it is not nature only that is sphinx-like, but we are told that the triune Creator of all is an "unutterable sphinx" himself. How *did* good Dr. Burr find it out? Who told him? Not the "unutterable" Creator, surely; not Nature, for she is hardly in a condition to articulate. Will Dr. Burr publish a sequel and show us whence came his revelation?

Will he also tell us how he ascertained this Creator to be not only an "unutterable sphinx," but, at the same time, "a mountain of spikenard," and also "a unit and a polygon facing every desideratum with a flashing side"? Will he also inform us, and others as anxious and curious as ourselves, what instrument enabled him to make the discovery that "the believer's last home" is at the centre of gravity of the entire universe of suns and worlds?

Finally, will he tell us, in closing, whether the "adult astronomy," which he prophesies, and which he assures us will be "fitted with the pictured and

dynamical wings of angels," is to be a revival of the system by which Joshua, as Dr. Burr assures us, circumvented the sun and moon and compelled them to remain "up" when they had engagements to "go down" and illuminate the benighted dwellers of the under side?

D. H. M.

SCIENCE OF KNOWLEDGE. Translated from the German of J. G. Fichte by A. E. Kroeger.

SCIENCE OF RIGHT. By the same. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co.

The translator of these works has performed a task for which, it is probable, that no man in America is better qualified. A German by birth, he has that familiarity with the language of the original which culture alone could scarcely give. Long resident in this country, he has made the English language a second vernacular. A scholar and an ardent Fichtean, he has all the aids of culture, and of thorough intellectual sympathy with the writer whose thought he attempts to present. Nor is it a slight advantage that he is himself a man of metaphysical ability, whose own writings have an acknowledged value. We are constrained to say that his version of Fichte is what might be expected under these advantageous circumstances. It is studiously literal, reflecting the exact character of Fichte's writing, while it has not that air of German merely run through an English dictionary which commonly belongs to a translation so strictly subordinated, not only to the purport, but to the style of the original. We commend it heartily as a piece of work capably and handsomely done.

Fichte was a noble man, a true gentleman, a devoted patriot, an intrepid thinker, an ardent and indomitable soul. Though he was a philosopher, his life was a poem. His eloquence, when he found occasion for it and gave it scope, was almost incomparable. His moral treatises breathe a spirit so high, pure and heroic, that they must be imperishable. As to his strictly metaphysical writing, we are disposed to speak with reserve, for there is no German metaphysician of high rank whom we find it so difficult to follow, and none with the direction of whose thought we so little coincide. He is the philosopher of individualism. His was perhaps the most powerful attempt ever yet made to present individualism as a complete and inclusive doctrine. He gives to it the broadest possible scope, and presents it in the noblest light. And as this doctrine represents the tendency and controlling faith of our time, Fichte should speak to willing listeners.

D. A. W.

WOMAN'S WORK AND WOMAN'S CULTURE. A series of essays edited by Josephine E. Butler. London: Macmillan & Co. 1869.

This volume is a valuable contribution to the literature of the woman's movement. It consists of ten different essays, one half written by men, and the other by women, treating of some of the most important topics affecting the political, social, and educational questions.

The thoughtful introduction of the editor treats the general subject largely

and ably, meeting, boldly and well, the most specious and plausible arguments against the enlarged freedom of woman's life. She, as well as the other essayists, boldly attacks the enemy in the very citadel of his defense, by claiming that the present popular restrictions on woman's energies and aspirations are destructive to the best features of home, and that it is only when man and woman are equally developed, and mutually helpful in all departments of human life, that home can be the sanctuary for the whole nature of man.

Miss Cobbe bases her argument on the value of every individual soul, and its right to live for an ultimate aim, and not a relative one. Martha exists to be Martha, and develop God's idea of Martha, and not to make John more comfortable, or even more well-behaved.

Jessie Bovcherett takes up the painful subject of "superfluous women," and tries to show that the true remedy for this evil is in encouraging men to emigrate to new lands, where their labor is needed, and to leave to women those occupations at home which they can perform.

Mr. Butler treats of education as a profession for women. In this country, this question hardly needs arguing. The profession of teaching is quite open to women, on the generous principle of half pay for equal service.

Miss Sophia Jex Blake makes an able statement of the advantages which the medical profession offers as an occupation for women.

But the most charming essay in the book is that of Mr. James Stuart on the "Teaching of Science." It is clear and full, showing the importance of a true scientific method to the development of true womanhood as well as manhood. In its quaint beauty of style it reminds us of Sir Thomas Browne. But, in its practical wisdom and largeness of view, it belongs to our own day.

Mr. Pearson's essay on "Some Historical Aspects of Family Life" is also very interesting, as showing the different condition of ancient and modern life. He fully answers the statement that our modern civilization rests on the family, showing that the state deals with the individual, and does not recognize the family as a unit at all. This essay is the more welcome, because the endeared name of John A. Andrew, unfortunately, has lent its weight to this specious fallacy of man's right to represent the family.

The other essays all have great value, but some of them are more especially applicable to the state of society in England than here.

It is exceedingly pleasant to note the large and generous appreciation of our own country in this book. Our success in solving many of the educational problems now under discussion in England is frequently mentioned with evident satisfaction; and, in return, we must say, that we cannot but admire the broad scope and thorough handling of the subject in these papers, which we often fail to find among our own reform writers. There is no heat, sarcasm, nor excited feeling, in the book: it is calm and scholarly, and yet practical, and we think its circulation would do much to invigorate the purpose and deepen the faith of those who are here working for woman.

E. D. C.

